Published
Monthly by the
NATIONAL
MUNICIPAL
LEAGUE
Volume XXII, No. 6
TOTAL NO. 204

NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW

Columbia University
Barnard College
Ella Weed Library

CONTENTS FOR JUNE

MUNICIPAL DEBT NUMBER

League's Business 258
Editorial Comment ..... *Howard P. Jones* 259
Headlines ..... *H. P. J.* 261
Paying Debts in a Depression ..... *Carl H. Chatters* 263
The Problem of Refunding ..... *Clifford W. Ham* 266
Bolstering Municipal Credit ..... *Paul V. Betters* 268
Table of Municipal Defaults 271
The Bonded Debt of 277 Cities as at January 1, 1933 ..... *C. E. Rightor* 272
Is Congress Representative? ..... *George H. Hallett, Jr.* 284
A Search for Facts in Government—A Supplement *Governmental Research Association* 301

DEPARTMENTS

I. Proportional Representation ..... *Edited by George H. Hallett, Jr.* 286
II. Recent Books Reviewed ..... *Edited by Edna Trull* 290
III. Governmental Research Association Notes ..... *Edited by Robert M. Paige* 294
IV. Notes and Events ..... *Edited by H. M. Olmsted* 296

The contents of the National Municipal Review are indexed in the *Engineering Index Service*, the *Index to Legal Periodicals*, the *International Index to Periodicals* and in *Public Affairs Information Service.*

COPYRIGHT, JUNE, 1933

THE LEAGUE'S BUSINESS

A Letter from a Governor.—

Hearty thanks for yours of April 19.

I am immensely pleased to have your proposals for governmental reorganization, and your comments on bills presented to the General Assembly of Pennsylvania. Unfortunately, the Assembly has made it plain in recent weeks that it is not interested in the slightest in real governmental economy and proposes only to use economy as a measure behind which it can tear down the vital functions of the state. Our task right now is to fight this sort of hypocrisy. . . .

With all good wishes and much appreciation,

Sincerely yours,

(signed) GIFFORD PINCHOT.

President Seasongood's Book Fills a Need.—Publication under the title, "Local Government in the United States, a challenge and an opportunity," by the Harvard University Press of the Godkin Lectures delivered at Harvard in 1932 by Murray Seasongood, president of the National Municipal League, has filled a real gap in municipal governmental literature. The lectures received wide attention at the time of their delivery. This book, which is reviewed in this issue by Charles A. Beard, may be obtained through the League office or the Harvard University Press.

Council Formally Approves Organizing Citizens Councils.—Formal approval of the action of the executive committee and the work of the staff of the National Municipal League in fostering the formation of local citizens councils was registered by resolution at the meeting of the officers and members of the council held at the Union League Club, Chicago, May 27-28. Coöperation with the local groups should form an important part of the work program of the League for the immediate future, it was felt.

The committee on citizens councils for constructive economy appointed by President Seasongood recently includes representatives of fifty-six national organizations coöperating with the National Municipal League in this project. The executive committee within this large committee which has power to act has the following membership:

Chairman—Thomas H. Reed
Vice Chairman—Harold S. Buttenheim
C. R. Mann
Carl H. Milam

Members—Mrs. Hugh Bradford
Louis Brownlow
Lee F. Hanmer
Mrs. Charles Cary Rumsey
Mrs. F. Louis Slade
Miss Belle Sherwin

HOWARD P. JONES, *Secretary.*

Editorial Comment
June

NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW

Vol. XXII, No. 6 Total No. 204

Harold W. Dodds Becomes President of Princeton University

Just as this issue was going to press, word was received that Harold W. Dodds, chairman of the editorial council of the NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW, who recently resigned as editor after serving in that capacity for twelve years, had been chosen president of Princeton University by the board of trustees. Dr. Dodds' long career of distinguished public service in the field of government makes the appointment peculiarly appropriate at this time when the most serious problems are facing government in all its branches, local, state, and national—when, indeed local government in some sections is almost at the point of breakdown.

Dr. Dodds served as secretary of the NATIONAL MUNICIPAL LEAGUE from 1920 to 1928. He became a lecturer in politics at Princeton in 1925, and professor of politics in 1927. He is chairman of the committee on political education of the American Political Science Association.

The emphasis which Princeton University in its choice of Professor Dodds as president thus indirectly places upon public affairs and government is distinctly encouraging.

Dayton Citizens' Council in Action

CRITICAL DELINQUENT TAX SITUATION LEADS COUNCIL TO LAUNCH VIGOROUS "PAY YOUR TAXES" CAMPAIGN

IF LOCAL government were completely abandoned in Montgomery County, Ohio, there would not be sufficient tax money coming in currently to take care of the debt service!

That was the critical situation faced by citizens of Dayton a month ago. It was a problem that could not be solved by the county officials. It was a problem that could not be solved by any particular group. It was a community job.

So Dayton formed a citizens' council, with Judge Carroll Sprigg as chairman, to see what could be done. Subcommittees were set up to discover what economies might be made in the various services of the local governments—per pupil costs of the school were analyzed—all in the endeavor to discover ways and means of curtailing essential services to the point where current revenues would take care of them. All efforts were fruitless. The more statistics were mar-

shalled the more it became evident that unless some way could be found to bring in taxes, debt service could not be met and fundamental functions of local government must be stopped. A breakdown of community life was in prospect.

What happened from that point on is silent testimony to the effectiveness of coöperative effort and leadership as it is inevitably developed through a citizens' council. The coöperation of some of Dayton's largest industries was sought —the National Cash Register Company —Delco Products Company, and others; all of which have quite a big stake in the community. These organizations arranged for some of their important executives to give full time to the work of the citizens' council. A "Pay Your Taxes" campaign was launched. It was not merely a publicity campaign designed to sell the idea to the public. A subcommittee of the council established itself in an office in the county court house, discovered that 40 per cent of the delinquent taxes were in the hands of less than 500 taxpayers, that delinquent taxes had jumped in three years from approximately $700,000 to approximately $12,000,000 and that the way out was through collection of some of those funds.

Dayton's economic situation had been serious. It was appreciated that in many instances non-payment of taxes represented actual inability to pay. On the other hand, it was also realized that many who could pay were taking advantage of the situation not to do so, and that others were letting their tax bills go in order to meet other obligations possibly of less immediate community importance.

So subcommittees started work in earnest. Prominent delinquent taxpayers were telephoned, requested to appear before the committee, and asked why they had not paid their taxes. Unless they could show that their financial situation was completely hopeless, the committee reasoned vigorously with them and put up to them flatly their responsibility to the community. This work is proceeding at a rapid rate. It is estimated that within another month the Dayton Citizens' Council will have several hundred individuals giving part time or full time to the work of the council—many of them employed on the delinquent tax problem.

But the Dayton Council has not stopped with the tax problem. It has realized that government in these times must be efficient. Auditors and accountants—all volunteer workers or assigned to the task by some of the industrial corporations—have been placed in the county offices, making checks of departmental systems, timing investigations and other inquiries designed to lead to recommendations which will result in increasing the efficiency of the services —that is, providing the same amount of governmental service at decreased cost.

The local officials are coöperating to the best of their ability. They appreciate that what is being done is to their interest as well as to the interest of the community. The city of Dayton, of course, operates under the city manager plan and local citizens question whether there can be much improvement in administrative methods in the city government. But the county government collects the taxes for the city and the county operating under the old political system with elective officials in the administrative offices is under a severe handicap which the officials themselves cannot overcome. An impartial citizens' agency, representing all groups in the population working with the officials, can accomplish much.

The Dayton Citizens' Council, in operation hardly more than a month, has in that short time demonstrated that there is local leadership that can be mobilized in any emergency provided a coördinating agency exists to furnish the opportunity for such leadership.

HEADLINES

The tide is turning. Conservative business and financial leaders are lining up on the side of the maintenance of essential local governmental services as opposed to indiscriminate cutting and slashing. "Pay Your Taxes" has become the slogan and symbol of the passing of hysteria.

* * *

Albemarle County, Virginia, has voted to adopt the county executive plan, which is the county manager plan slightly modified to give the board more authority than it would have under the orthodox manager set-up. Several other Virginia counties are interested.

* * *

Laws providing for permanent registration of voters have been passed by the Indiana and Illinois legislatures. This logical and economical plan is spreading rapidly as satisfactory experience accumulates.

* * *

Bills which would have repealed direct primary laws were defeated in Indiana, Kansas, North Carolina, South Dakota, and West Virginia, according to reports from the National League of Women Voters.

* * *

Hackensack, New Jersey, has adopted the city manager plan. This is the fourth New Jersey city to take such action. Movements for the adoption of the manager plan are under way in several other New Jersey cities and the Hackensack victory should have welcome repercussions elsewhere.

* * *

Utica, New York, will again vote on the manager plan June 30. About a year ago Utica electors approved the plan but the court declared the election void because the city clerk had failed to carry out certain provisions of the law regarding advertisements of the election. Indignant Uticans should give the plan a bigger majority than before.

* * *

Pennsylvania voters will have an opportunity this fall to rescue Pittsburgh from the impasse on its plan for metropolitan government—the proposition of removing from the original consolidation amendment to the constitution the requirement that the proposal must be approved by a *two-thirds* vote in a majority of the municipal subdivisions.

A bill providing for appointment of a joint committee to study the reorganization of state government has been passed by the Utah legislature.

* * *

Detroit municipal scrip is going begging these days with some merchants refusing to accept it. The money problem is not so easy to solve locally.

* * *

A forty million dollar slum eradication project is planned by Mayor Curley of Boston with R. F. C. money. Housing begins to come into its own as a municipal problem.

* * *

Maple Heights, suburb of Cleveland, Ohio, closes its schools early and may be unable to reopen them in the fall; merely one example of a pending peril and an illustration of the need for a citizens' council in critical local situations.

* * *

Delinquent taxpayers in Cook County, Illinois, are stampeding in the attempt to pay up quickly, before action is taken under provisions of the new Skarda law which makes possible appointment of a receiver to take over a property and run it until the tax money has been collected.

* * *

In Detroit the corporation counsel has decided the treasurer has authority to collect rents from tenants of buildings on which taxes are delinquent—which is another effective way of collecting taxes quickly!

* * *

The New York City board of estimate has evolved a novel tax scheme—a city registration fee for automobiles and bridge tolls to be paid by cars from outside the city. The car of a local citizen is to carry a medallion giving free passage on bridges. And the tax on taxicabs becomes highly significant with the addition of a five-cent fee per passenger.

* * *

Traffic signs in a southwestern city have gone to seed as one consequence of false economy. One traffic accident might be enough to affect this form of foolish saving.

* * *

County home rule, permitting the local adoption of modern types of county government, is expected to be voted on in August in the state of Texas.

Columbia University
Barnard College
New York City

Paying Debts in a Depression

Frank facing of facts and use of refunding procedure seen as essentials to intelligent solution of present problems

CARL H. CHATTERS

Executive Director, Municipal Finance Officers' Association of the United States and Canada

THE present generation of public officials for the first time faces the payment of burdensome public debts in a period of extreme deflation. Public and private debts alike must be paid with dollars that are worth more, and are more difficult to obtain than they were when the debts were incurred. Moral courage, a spirit of fair play, and a knowledge of the facts must therefore be displayed by both the debtor and creditor groups if neither is to suffer from changed conditions.

The approach to the municipal debt problem indicates that the interested parties are not familiar with, or do not care to recognize, the lessons learned from previous periods of this kind in our national history. In the depressions of 1837 and 1857 there were some defaults. The panic of 1873 and subsequent years brought a period of readjustment which involved a far greater proportion of the public debts than we now find it necessary to deal with. The experience of these years ought to show that neither the debtor nor the creditor group profited by long drawn out litigation which extended in many cases for a generation, and in numerous cases for as long as ten years. Neither have we seen fit to profit by the experience of Canadian municipalities. The provincial governments in Canada are unhampered by our constitutional limitations and for many years have had statutes which permit and facilitate the adjustment of municipal debt problems. It would be well, therefore, to learn of these past experiences and to profit by them.

SOME CAN PAY

Municipal corporations might be classified into three general groups with respect to their debt-paying ability. There are those which can pay in full and carry on their normal functions in the usual way. The same group includes cities which can pay in full by making adjustments of operating expenses without curtailing essential services. No city in this group should attempt refunding merely to reduce current taxes and leave its debt to future generations.

A second large group consists of those cities which are not able now to meet their debts in full but which can eventually pay by the simple process of refunding the bond principal and paying it at a later date.

The third group, which may as well be recognized by those who want to face the problem squarely, consists of cities whose credit has been exploited to the breaking point by private interests or by local political groups. In this group the debts are so great that it is apparent from all indications that it will never be possible to meet all obligations in full. It is quite natural to assume that different treat-

ment and a different approach should be accorded each of these three groups. This classification should not imply that scaling down of debts will have to be a general procedure, since the vast majority of public bodies can and will eventually pay their obligations in full.

REFUNDING IS SOLUTION

The logical solution to the debt problem is to refund the existing bonds into new obligations. The refunding bonds in many of these cases cannot be sold and must therefore be exchanged with present holders. It is not possible to obtain the consent of all bondholders even in cases where the settlement seems favorable to the city and to the majority of its creditors. If we admit, then, that refunding offers the major solution to debt troubles, we must have the machinery for such refunding. This must consist of state legislation and some federal law such as the proposed Wilcox Bill. The state laws should grant broad refunding powers to all municipal corporations subject to the approval of some state agency. Federal legislation in the nature of an amendment to the bankruptcy bill should permit a federal district court to make binding on all creditors, any agreement which is satisfactory to the great majority of creditors. If such a plan is fair for private corporations and if it is logical, as business corporations have been urging, to extend the bankruptcy powers already granted to private corporations, it is just as fair and just as logical to extend it to public bodies.

The refunding of municipal bonds is not simple. Cities must first find out who owns their bonds and what these creditors wish to do. Frequently negotiations are carried on through a bondholders' committee, supposedly representing the holders of the bonds and generally composed of bond dealers. From the standpoint of the city it would be well for these committees to consist at least in part of actual holders of bonds. Public officials certainly should take the lead in bringing about any adjustments and should try to get in touch with the creditors and discuss the problem with the more important bondholders before any organization is attempted. In some cases citizens' groups have been able to assist both the bondholders' committee and the municipality.

SCALING DOWN MAY BE NECESSARY

The ability to pay is the chief question at issue in any refunding plan. Whether or not any refunding is necessary must first be decided. Then, if it must be done, the dates of maturity of the bonds and the rates of interest return must be determined. If the city's ability to pay leads to the conclusion that the debt cannot be paid dollar for dollar, some means must be found of scaling down the debt. Perhaps one of the most logical methods is to lower the interest rate to the point where some surplus funds exist for the establishment of a sinking fund. The money accumulated in this way should be used to purchase bonds in the open market at low prices or to retire bonds by lot or call from time to time. Experts in municipal finance have been urging the use of serial bonds exclusively. This cannot apply to bonds refunded under existing financial conditions by cities with heavy debts. In these communities the bonds should be term bonds payable from a fund created in the manner suggested above or in some other way, the sinking fund to be exhausted periodically by the purchase of the securities for whose redemption it was created. Such a step offers the most logical way to scale down a debt.

THE PROBLEM OF INTEREST

What interest rate shall a city pay on refunding bonds? Assuming that refunding will be attempted, and that a market exists for the bonds of a particular municipality, the rate, of course,

will be determined by the market. Many debt adjustments are being made, however, by exchanging new obligations called refunding bonds with the holders of outstanding obligations. This involves no sale. In many such cases the interest rates on the new bonds have been higher than they were on the old ones. The city of Chicago on January 1, 1933, refunded $15,000,000 4 per cent bonds in new bonds bearing 6 per cent. Both creditors and municipalities must consider the effect of these increased costs.

WHO HOLDS THE BONDS?

Many social and economic questions are involved in the payment of debts. Unfortunately, anyone who suggests adjustments on the basis of ability to pay, or intimates that public obligations may have to be scaled down, is considered a debt repudiator. It is interesting to know that nearly one-half of the outstanding state and municipal bonds in this country are held by wealthy investors and by corporations. Little more than 5 per cent of the gross outstanding bonds are owned by insurance companies, and perhaps 15 per cent by banks. The "little fellow" is hardly in the picture at all, and certainly has less than 5 per cent of the outstanding obligations. These facts may present a different picture than is frequently drawn of those who would be affected if municipal bonds by any chance had to be scaled down. Social problems may be presented through the curtailment of local expenditures in order to permit the payment in full of public debts. The social losses sustained by a community should be weighed carefully by any group of creditors demanding payment of their obligations, because after all, a "going concern" is a better risk than a corporation which has ceased to perform its usual functions.

Persons interested in local debt situations should insist that a full and complete statement of all pertinent factors be prepared at once. They should guard against the exploitation of a city by someone wishing to take from it an excessive fee for handling the refunding. One Florida county, for instance, is paying 4 per cent to its fiscal agent for accomplishing this transfer of bonds. The same thing applies to pressure for economy. In one large eastern city, bankers forced certain savings on the local government which they promptly put into their own pockets in financing operations.

Citizens and officials alike must consider carefully the future cost in dollars and cents of their failure to pay their debts in full on the due date. They must also consider the legal rights and remedies of the bondholders. It is equally fair, of course, that creditors should consider that the debts are being paid by human beings who must make some sacrifice, in many cases a material one, to accomplish the payment. Only settlements based on full knowledge of the facts and prepared in a spirit of fairness will accomplish anything for either the debtor or the creditor group.

The Problem of Refunding

Considerations which should guide city in working out plan suggested by writer who has been up against job

CLIFFORD W. HAM — *Director, Atlantic City Survey Commission*

THE disintegration of municipal credit and finance, which has now been pushed to the front in American city problems is one more step in the progress of the economic depression. Nothing like it has been known. Prior to three years ago the failure of a municipality to meet its principal and interest promptly was such a rare and infrequent occurrence that it was treated as a curiosity. Three and one-half years of the most serious financial stress our cities have ever experienced has resulted in a situation unprecedented. Dwindling cash receipts from taxes, even though levies have been reduced; impounding in many cases of city funds in restricted banks; loss of credit for current financing; inability to meet bond and interest maturities, and many other factors serve to confuse the problem.

Faced with a critical municipal debt situation, Atlantic City has had to give serious consideration to the problem of refunding. The Atlantic City Survey Commission, of which Clifford W. Ham is director, has worked out a number of principles to serve as a guide to municipal policy in the matter.

The actual percentage of municipal debt now in default is small. The situation has become very general throughout the country, however, and it is essential that some general principles be outlined and some standard practices developed in refinancing municipal debts. Here are submitted, therefore, some suggestions of that nature.

MUNICIPAL DEBTS UNIQUE

Municipal debts differ entirely from federal, state, or private debts. The security in the case of federal and state debts is the promise to pay. There is no way a bondholder can force collection. No collateral is pledged back of such loans. Nor can the federal and state governments be sued without their consent.

In the case of private debts there is the promise of the debtor to pay and the repayment depends upon his ability and the value of his property. The creditor has recourse to the courts in his efforts to collect. When an individual or private corporation is unable to pay, the right of bankruptcy, or receivership, exists as a method of scaling down the debt. After such procedure they may begin over, free from the old debts. No such right has yet been recognized for any city or governmental unit.

No collateral is pledged as security for a municipal loan, but it is made upon the "full faith and credit" of the municipality. This full faith and credit includes the right to tax. While state and federal debts are paid from taxation also, the point of difference between municipal security and state and federal security, is that the creditor can compel,

Columbia University
Barnard College
The Millicent C. Library

in the case of the municipality, the levy of the tax. In the case of state and federal obligations he cannot so compel the levying of the necessary tax to pay the debt.

A city operates in perpetuity and the power to tax is a continuing one. It is inconceivable that the total income of a city should cease. Therefore, the right of winding up its affairs through receivership or bankruptcy and starting over cannot apply in the case of municipalities.

THREE GROUPS INVOLVED

There are three groups vitally concerned in this present-day situation and each group is pressing for an immediate answer. They are:

First: The creditors of the city, or the bondholders. Good faith must be exercised not only by the city, but by the bondholder. Upon default the bondholder has the legal right to secure judgment and compel the city authorities by a mandamus to levy in the next year's tax budget the amount of the judgment. It will little avail the bondholder, however, to add to the tax burdens of a municipality the exhorbitant levies which will but add to tax delinquency. When creditors force burdensome and confiscatory tax levies, the economic life of the community can easily be destroyed and the intrinsic value of all property impaired. The bondholder is directly concerned with the city's good faith and with the ability of the city to perform the prime functions of government. Continuing service is fundamental if the people are to pay the debts.

Second: The debtors of the community, or the taxpayers. American municipalities in general are facing insistent demands on the part of taxpayers for a reduction in the current burden. Associations of various kinds are now at work whose sole thought is the reduction of taxes regardless of the other factors in the picture.

There is no question about the seriousness of the present tax load and there can be no quarrel with attempts to lighten the burden. Nevertheless, the taxpayers are the debtors and as such must be prepared to meet the obligations incurred to the fullest extent within their ability to pay.

Third: Public officials and the personnel of government upon whom rests the responsibility for the continued performance of governmental functions. They now find themselves quite as powerless to meet the problems of economic stress as the directing heads of many private corporations. The prime functions of government must be performed regardless of municipal income. All other problems of the community can be solved only after such a recognition. The responsibility resting upon the personnel of government must be realized.

GOVERNMENT MUST BE KEPT GOING

Certain primary assumptions must be considered by each city in working out its financial policy:

Municipal credit is valuable and should be maintained inviolate if possible.

The municipality desires to meet its just obligations as fully as within its power. It does not approach this problem with any notion of repudiation or renunciation of its indebtedness, or of driving bargains for its pledged word. The only hope is to adjust the burden to the best interests of the debtor and creditor in the long view.

The chief threat to debt security is the possibility of breakdown in governmental functions. Municipal government must continue to perform, for unless the primary services of a city are maintained the whole structure upon which debt security rests is in danger.

(Continued on Page 270)

Bolstering Municipal Credit

Federal ointment for municipal wounds regarded by writer as vital to prevent aggravation of crisis

PAUL V. BETTERS *Executive Director, The American Municipal Association*

It has for some months been evident that the serious municipal finance situation would probably necessitate federal legislation in behalf of distressed local governments.[1] Week by week since early in the year conditions have gradually grown more acute, not only in the case of so-called "insolvent" municipalities but also in scores of cities in apparently sound financial condition. Yet this widespread breakdown of municipal credit has caught us unawares.

On May 1, approximately sixty of the one hundred largest cities in the United States found the demand for municipal securities, particularly for short-term tax anticipation notes or warrants, almost nil. Even a number of A-1 gilt-edge municipal long-term bond issues were unsuccessfully offered by cities known to be fiscally sound. As this is being written a few hopeful signs are to be observed on the horizon but they are not substantial enough to change the general picture.

In many states the tax collection period for cities does not fit in with the fiscal period. For that reason local governments are forced to live on borrowed money for several months pending the collection of taxes. In the past little difficulty was experienced in disposing of tax anticipation certificates. Cash was thus received with which to operate, and, except for the unjustifiable cost of interest on these short-term loans, the system fared well.

WHY MUNICIPALS WON'T SELL

We now find, however, due to factors over which the municipalities have little control, that the established sources of credit are dried up, that certain cities are facing serious financial difficulties because of their inability to borrow pending the collection of taxes, and that unless credit is provided through some channel, serious consequences are likely to occur.

I have talked to bankers, investment dealers, and municipal officials in an effort to ascertain the factors contributing to this depressing state of affairs. All seem agreed that the following are causal items: (1) the increasing volume of tax delinquency; (2) the increasing number of defaults; (3) the inability or unwillingness of the banks to absorb the ordinary borrowing needs; and (4) the flood of state legislation being considered or already adopted postponing or wiping out delinquencies and also easing current tax collection procedures.

As Mayor Curley of Boston, president of the United States Conference of Mayors, explained on May 3, to the

[1]See "Federal Aid for Municipalities," National Municipal Review, April, 1933.

Senate Committee on Banking and Currency:

> The assessors start out the first of April of each year to assess property. Their work covers a period of about six weeks. Their books are made up. Their tax bills are sent out about the first day of October, and money begins to flow in about the 15 of October. As the money comes in they pay the obligations represented by money that has been borrowed on short-term notes, so that many cities are required to live on borrowed money for a period of months each year.
>
> In ordinary times Boston would require about twenty to twenty-two millions of dollars. This year we estimate we require about fifty-seven millions in borrowed money to conduct the activities of the city, even with the exercise of every reasonable and sane economy that it is possible to practice.

IF CREDIT FAILS

What will be the results if cities find it impossible to market their short-term tax anticipation notes or warrants? First of all, there will be payless pay days in many of the cities of the country. We shall have a scattering of Chicagos in nearly every state of the Union. That is a picture itself which is not in harmony with efficient municipal administration. Secondly, there will be an abundance of local scrip—substitute money—floating around in each of the financially distressed communities. We already have a substantial quantity of it, but the amount now in circulation will be small compared to what will be issued if cash is not obtained. Some of the cities which have utilized tax anticipation scrip up to the time this is written are Chicago, Detroit, Newark, and Atlanta. State enabling legislation on scrip has recently been enacted in several states.

Thirdly, defaults in certain major and many smaller cities will be inevitable, for if cash is not on hand to meet maturing obligations no other course of action is open. While refunding will be possible in numerous cases, such operations are time-consuming and cannot be successfully conducted overnight. Lastly, additional cuts and slashes in services will undoubtedly have to be made. These additional forced curtailments will permanently impair the proper functioning of the government of several cities where radical reductions have previously been carried out.

THE WAY OUT

To avoid this, there seems to be at the moment but one avenue of relief open, and that is for the federal government to extend the same credit privileges to public corporations as it has to private corporations. If private channels are unable to meet the usual credit needs of the cities either the Federal Reserve Banks or the Reconstruction Finance Corporation should be authorized to purchase or make loans, under proper safeguards, on tax anticipation paper. From the point of view of the government, the security behind these loans or purchases would be of the highest order. Tax notes and warrants constitute a first lien against the property of a community, having priority over mortgages.

When this proposal was presented on May 3 to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and to the President, by the executive committee of the United States Conference of Mayors, it was suggested that loans be made up to 75 per cent of the 1933 levies; up to 50 per cent of the 1932 delinquencies, and that a limit of two years be fixed for repayment. These suggestions would appear to provide proper security for such loans as the government might make.

If the national government is not willing to take the above step, it could ease the situation to a marked degree by making tax anticipation notes or warrants eligible for rediscount privileges at the Federal Reserve Banks. This action would meet the liquidity issue raised by the banks.

By making credit available, a large group of cities will be able to function

normally. Two other steps, however, should be taken. A national campaign to get people to pay their taxes must be initiated and severe penalties inflicted upon those taxpayers able but unwilling to meet their tax responsibilities. Chicago is at present experimenting with a novel piece of legislation in this connection and it is being closely watched throughout the country. In that city, teeth have been put in the tax collection laws by authorizing the appointment of "receivers" for property on which taxes have been delinquent for a period of six months or more. These "receivers" can apply the income received on properties to the payment of past due taxes. Another law requires property owners to deposit 75 per cent of the amount of their tax bills before filing tax objections. Finally, something must be done to clear up defaults which, if allowed to hang fire, will continue to have an adverse effect on municipal credit. States are unable, due to the constitutional prohibition against impairment of contract, to effectively handle the default situation. If a measure such as the Wilcox Bill now pending in Congress and enabling a settlement between cities and their creditors under the bankruptcy laws were enacted, then order could be brought out of chaos. With a thousand defaulted local governments estopped from any final debt arrangement, it is mandatory that legal machinery for debt adjustment be provided.

While it is conceivable that national plans for economic recovery may turn what is believed to be a distressing picture into a more hopeful state of affairs, it is certain that municipalities today are facing one of the most serious crises in the history of local government. We are beginning to realize that a national economic program cannot be built upon a foundation which presupposes an autonomous and independent fiscal structure for our urban areas.

THE PROBLEM OF REFUNDING

(Continued from Page 267)

Successful financial operation can be achieved only by centralized financial control, both as regards operation, capital outlay, and debt service.

In the long run, the public is best served by full information on municipal affairs.

A proper solution of the present financial problems will determine municipal credit and the ability to perform municipal functions for some time to come. For this reason the responsibility rests with the municipalities, and not primarily with the bondholders or their protective committees. The city must be the negotiator. The bondholders have not been, and cannot be, and furthermore will not allow themselves to become, responsible for city operation. Neither are they in a position to determine the essential needs of that operation. Those needs can be taken care of only if the city in its refinancing program compels proper planning for them. The burden rests with the city.

It is impossible for a city now in financial straits to guarantee any fixed payment from current receipts. To do so might invite further default soon after refunding is completed. Good faith will be maintained and the obligations of the city discharged if, levying the required debt service, the tax collections therefor are segregated and paid on the debt. This presumes, of course, proper municipal operation and proper segregation and earmarking of the tax collections.

Municipal credit can be maintained. It will require the development of some such general principles as discussed herein and the writing of standard practices. Public administration demands the development of a technique for municipal refinancing.

SUMMARY OF STATE AND MUNICIPAL DEFAULTS

As Reported to *The Bond Buyer*, New York

Revised to May 5, 1933

	States	Counties	Cities and Towns	School Districts	Other Districts	TOTAL Number Municipalities	Reclamation, Levee, Irri., & Drainage Districts	Spec. Assmt.	GRAND TOTAL Municipalities and Spec. Districts
Alabama	..	..	7	..	..	7	1	..	8
Arizona	..	2	2	..	2	6	1	3	10
Arkansas	1	6	3	10	..	20	19	4	43
California	..	1	4	3	..	8	62	3	73
Colorado	..	1	6	10	..	17	4	3	24
Connecticut	..	..	2	..	..	2	..	..	2
Florida	..	30	71	16	9	126	13	..	139
Georgia	..	1	1	3	..	5	..	..	5
Idaho	..	..	1	..	..	1	2	6	9
Illinois	..	1	5	7	7	20	2	6	28
Indiana	..	..	1	..	..	1	..	5	6
Iowa	..	..	6	..	..	6	..	1	7
Kansas	..	..	4	..	..	4	..	..	4
Kentucky	..	23	5	4	..	32	..	2	34
Louisiana	1	8	..	3	..	12	10	2	24
Maine	..	..	1	..	..	1	..	..	1
Michigan	..	3	15	7	..	25	1	2	28
Minnesota	..	2	..	..	..	2	..	..	2
Mississippi	..	6	6	3	..	15	5	..	20
Missouri	.	7	9	16	..	32	9	..	41
Montana	..	..	1	..	..	1	3	..	4
Nebraska	..	..	1	5	..	6	2	1	9
Nevada	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	2
New Jersey	..	..	10	2	..	12	..	1	13
New Mexico	..	..	3	2	..	5	..	2	7
New York	..	..	1	..	1	2	..	..	2
North Carolina	..	43	100	6	..	149	2	..	151
North Dakota	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	1
Ohio	..	5	48	23	..	76	..	5	81
Oklahoma	..	2	12	3	..	17	..	1	18
Oregon	..	..	17	1	..	18	17	..	35
Pennsylvania	..	..	8	2	1	11	..	..	11
South Carolina	1	4	6	2	..	13	..	..	13
South Dakota	..	..	..	1	..	1	1	..	2
Tennessee	..	18	4	..	..	22	5	..	27
Texas	..	27	22	11	9	69	11	2	82
Utah	..	..	3	1	..	4	5	..	9
Virginia	..	1	1	..	..	2	..	..	2
Washington	..	..	3	..	..	3	3	13	19
Wisconsin	..	2	1	..	..	3	2	..	5
Wyoming	..	..	1	..	..	1	1	2	4
Total	3	193	391	141	29	757	183	65	1005

The Bonded Debt of 277 Cities as at January 1, 1933

Increase in net per capita debt over year ago reported although many cities have reduced obligations

C. E. RIGHTOR — *Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research*

THE accompanying tabulation is a summary report of the bonded debt of the cities of the United States and Canada as at January 1, 1933, and includes 277 cities, of which thirteen are Canadian.

The table presents the total gross bonded indebtedness, and a subdivision of this total into three general classes by purposes—general public improvements, schools, and utilities; the total sinking fund, with a similar subdivision by purpose reported in percentages only; the net total bonded debt; the net bonded debt to be retired from general taxes (reported as "excluding self-supporting"), both total and per capita; and the total gross special assessment debt.

The presentation of the data is the same as in previous tabulations. The cities are listed in order of population according to the 1930 census, and by the five census groups, these figures being more reliable than subsequent non-official estimates. The population figures of the Canadian cities are the latest census data.

The object of the compilation is to make available in concise form an up-to-date statement of the total amount of bonded debt, and the amount of that debt which is a liability of the property and citizens of each community. Comparisons are thus easily possible with cities of similar population or per capita debt. While for the great majority of cities these data can be definitely compiled and clearly presented, there are numerous complications in some cities. Whether to include all or a portion of an overlapping governmental unit, as a county, must be determined. It is noted that the Census Bureau's annual report *Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of Over 30,000* includes with the statistics of sixteen of the largest cities a percentage of the entire data of the county, based upon the ratio between the assessed valuation of the city and the county. This practice is not followed herein, however, no portion of the county or state debt being included.

There exist also numerous special districts created by state or local laws, whose debt must be considered, and which figures are included in as consistent a manner as possible. It is essential to state in this connection that reference must be made to the footnotes in order that the exact status of each city be ascertained.

In reporting net debt, there is shown separately the amount thereof, which is to be retired ultimately from taxes, by deducting the amount which is to be met from the earnings of revenue-producing utilities or other services. The columns "Excluding self-supporting" report this net figure, and the only per capita debt figure is upon this basis.

Owing to the extent of indebtedness

in many cities in the form of special assessment bonds, which commonly have been issued upon the faith and credit of the municipality, a report is made of the total gross debt of this kind. The amount is not considered, however, in reporting the net per capita debt of any city.

Based upon estimates of the Treasury Department, the aggregate state and municipal bonded debt of the country on January 1, 1933, was approximately $16,000,000,000, an increase of ten billions of dollars since 1921. Of this amount it is found that the total gross debt of the 258 cities of the United States reporting completely in this tabulation was $7,850,000,000, and the net excluding self-supporting was $5,250,000,000, or a net per capita debt of $118.55. The total gross debt of the twelve Canadian cities reporting completely was $489,000,000 and the net excluding self-supporting, $229,000,000, or a net per capita of $120.94.

Analysis of the data shows a wide range in the amount of per capita net debt, excluding self-supporting. Except for Washington, which has no debt, the figures range from $5.13 for Springfield, Illinois, to $361.52 for Atlantic City.

By census groups, the range is from $79.59 for Los Angeles to $218.62 for Philadelphia, in the group I cities; in group II, from $70.64 for Seattle to $168.49 for Rochester; in group III, the variation is from $15.69 for Peoria to $245.82 for Miami; in the group IV cities, the range is as already reported for Springfield and Atlantic City; in group V, from $13.00 to $348.91, for Quincy, Illinois, and White Plains, respectively. For the Canadian cities, a variation in per capita is found from $43.07 in Winnipeg to $245.22 in Edmonton.

The history of the creation of this vast municipal indebtedness, and the circumstances and conditions which dictated its growth in each case, would be of inestimable value as a guide to future municipal financial policies, but these matters are of course beyond the scope of a general analysis such as this.

It is of interest to know the trend of this debt, which may be learned by comparison of the figures of the present year with those of one year ago. Limiting this comparison to the net per capita debt of 248 cities which reported both years, it is found that there was an increase of $4.96, or from $114.36 to $119.32. This is the same amount of increase as was found for one year ago compared with 1931.

Exclusive of New York City, however, the increase for 235 comparable cities in the United States was only 65 cents per capita,—from $104.28 to $104.93. Of these cities, 149 reported a reduction in net debt, and 86 cities an increase. Further, only in census group I did the number of cities increasing the net debt exceed the number reporting a reduction. Of the twelve comparable Canadian cities, five reported a net increase, and seven a reduction, the net amount of increase being 64 cents, or from $128.13 in 1932 to $128.77 in 1933. Increase in bonded debt seems to be pegged at least temporarily.

A comparison of the growth of municipal debt over a nine-year period was made for eighty cities in the first three census groups, which reported both in 1924 and 1933. The population of these cities increased from 26,940,000 in 1920 to 33,250,000 in 1930, or 23.4 per cent. From 1924 to 1933, their gross debt increased from $3,732,000,000 to $6,661,000,000, or 78 per cent; their net debt (excluding self-supporting) from slightly over two billions to $4,336,000,000 or 102 per cent; and their net per capita from $79.60 to $130.41, or 64 per cent.

It is reported by the Municipal Securities Committee of the Investment Bankers Association that there was a net increase in state and municipal in-

debtedness during 1932 of about three hundred million dollars. This assumes total issues of $907,000,000, of which $100,000,000 was R. F. C. loans to be deducted, while maturities are estimated at the annual average of $500,000,000. The *Bond Buyer* reports the same amount of issues for the year, and in a further analysis shows that beginning in 1923 the annual record of long term loans exceeded one billion dollars until 1932. During 1929, according to the same authority, voters approved $420,995,000 in bonds; in 1930, $626,059,000; in 1931, $474,489,000; and in 1932, only $132,196,000. On bond issues, even the voters adopted conservatism as a motto.

As in prior years, the tabulation is limited to bonded debt. Were unfunded or temporary loans included, the total debt would be increased, as the extent of borrowing in anticipation of taxes and bond sales has increased of late.

A new form of borrowing has arisen within the year—that of loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for emergency relief and self-liquidating projects. During 1932, $112,000,000 was borrowed by the states on behalf of local communities, only seven million dollars of which is represented by bonds (under Section 1, subsection "e" of the R. F. C. Act) reported in the table. The remainder is a liability of the local units to the state, but is not included as a part of their debt. For self-liquidating loans, $137,000,000 was authorized and $18,000,000 actually advanced.

It is reported that over one thousand communities, including at least two states, have defaulted in whole or part upon their debt. It is clear that the essential services of city government cannot be reduced beyond a certain amount, so that while tax delinquency continues at a high rate, funds are not available for debt service. Additional defaults will surely occur unless refunding programs are effected. It is certain that federal legislation establishing a moratorium on debt payments is necessary in some cases. In many instances procedure under an amendment to the bankruptcy law would be sufficient. This is the objective of the Wilcox Municipal Debt Refinancing bill, which provides that a city confronted with default may seek, with a representation of its creditors, through the federal court an orderly readjustment of its debt, and that when this plan has been accepted by a substantial majority of its creditors, it shall be binding upon all creditors.

The public is going to hear more of the composition of public debt through the coöperation of public officials with bondholders committees. In these negotiations, it may be predicted that city officials and the creditors are going to give sympathetic attention to both sides of the problem.

To those interested in comparing the debt data with assessed valuations and tax rates of any city, reference may be made to the tabulation of tax rates published in the December, 1932, REVIEW.

This tabulation has been made possible through the voluntary coöperation of a large number of public officials in the 309 cities in the United States and 18 cities in Canada, supplemented in some instances by citizen agencies. This coöperation is hereby acknowledged, and it is hoped that it will be continued for future compilations.

BONDED DEBT OF 277 CITIES AS AT JANUARY 1, 1933

Compiled by the Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research, Inc.

From Data Furnished by Members of the Governmental Research Association, City Officials, and Chambers of Commerce

City	Census 1930	Gross Bonded Debt: General Improvement	Gross Bonded Debt: Public School	Gross Bonded Debt: Public Utility	Gross Bonded Debt: Total	Sinking Fund: Total	Sinking Fund: General improvement (per cent)	Sinking Fund: Public school (per cent)	Sinking Fund: Public utility (per cent)	Net Bonded Debt: Total	Net Bonded Debt: Excluding self-supporting	Net Bonded Debt: Per capita excluding self-supporting	Total gross special assessment debt	No.
GROUP I														
Pop. 500,000 and over														
1. New York, N. Y.[1]	6,930,446	$2,294,688,191	.....	.....	$2,294,688,191	$454,136,930	...	...	...	$1,184,551,261	$1,340,551,261	$193.43	$92,000,000*	1
2. Chicago, Ill.[2]	3,376,438	321,347,091	$28,975,000	$7,287,000	357,609,091	N	...	...	...	357,609,091	357,609,091	105.91	.....	2
3. Philadelphia, Pa.[3]	1,950,961	555,959,600	68,661,000	.....	624,620,600	138,099,678	83	17	...	486,520,922	426,520,922	218.62	N	3
4. Detroit, Mich.[4]	1,568,662	165,212,731	68,529,020	117,667,000	351,408,751	33,639,979	39	30	31	317,768,772	231,503,515	147.58	5,834,351	4
5. Los Angeles, Calif.[5]	1,238,048	44,684,198	53,857,608	110,798,750	209,340,556	3,279,431	...	...	100	206.061,125	98,541,806	79.59	11,369,451	5
6. Cleveland, Ohio[6]	900,430	87,264,363	21,431,000	29,647,500	138,342,863	13,064,760	80	...	20	125,278,103	98,231,433	109.09	7,443,414	6
7. St. Louis, Mo.	821,960	70,677,000	2,007,000	9,525,000	82,209,000	7,327,717	76	16	8	74,881,283	65,928,855	80.21	N	7
8. Baltimore, Md.	804,874	133,952,308	28,610,671	36,465,500	199,028,479	29,249,844	87	3	10	169,778,635	136,269,912	169.31	750,000	8
9. Boston, Mass.[7]	781,188	83,027,800	7,627,000	72,370,700	163,025,500	38,077,349	59	7	34	124,948,151	65,310,526	83.60	.....	9
10. Pittsburgh, Pa.	669,817	53,334,400	23,476,137	7,803,700	84,614,237	3,201,331	51	47	2	81,412,906	73.670,197	109.99	N	10
11. San Francisco, Calif.[8]	634,394	39,576,200	13,450,000	110,929,000	163,955,200	N	...	...	...	163,955,200	94,255,200	148.55	.....	11
12. Milwaukee, Wis.[9]	578,249	55,249,934	10,680,500	39,000	65,969,434	4,338,308	78	21	1	61,631,126	61,608,126	106.54	N	12
13. Buffalo, N. Y.	573,076	54,204,196	27,072,500	17,526,020	98,802,716	5,756,198	18	...	82	93,046,518	80,221,854	139.98	823,083	13
GROUP II														
Pop. 300,000 to 500,000														
14. Washington, D. C.	486,869	(No Bonded Debt)												14
15. Minneapolis, Minn.[10]	464,356	28,463,088	22,946,924	4,435,000	55,845,012	6,640,269	61	34	5	49,204,743	45,685,249	98.38	10,202,962	15
16. New Orleans, La.[11]	458,762	53,790,000	6,000,000*	3,000,000*	62,790,000	N	...	...	...	62,790,000	59,790,000	130.33	.....	16
17. Cincinnati, Ohio[12]	451,160	53.079,529	17,211,500	43,839,030	114,130,059	38,775,547	50	8	42	75,354,512	44,426,069	98.47	6,016,916	17
18. Newark, N. J.[13]	442,337	32,419,500	20,801,200	46,962,000	100,182,700	13,713,331	50	29	21	86,469,369	65,918,081	149.02	10,589,000	18
19. Kansas City, Mo.	399,746	21,682,000	20,943,300	13,400,000	56,025,300	7,941,207	19	21	60	48,084,093	36.320,033	90.86	.....	19
20. Seattle, Wash.[14]	365,583	14,923,150	12,098,000	50,036,000	77,057,150	1,195,725	100	...	...	75.861,425	25,825,425	70.64	23,392,159	20
21. Indianapolis, Ind.[15]	364,161	17,861,138	10,644,000	N	28,505,138	1,877,422	62	38	...	26,627,716	26,627.716	73.12	5,559,838	21
22. Rochester, N. Y.[16]	328,132	62,498,370		12,334,500	74,832,870	7,210,665	...	...	...	67,622,205	55,287,705	168.49	.....	22
23. Jersey City, N. J.[17]	316,715	26,196,300	15,393,000	16,561,255	58,150,555	8,463,093	42	20	38	48,687,462	36,606.581	115.58	938,500	23
24. Louisville, Ky.[18]	307,745	27,549,900	9,966,400	1,079,000	38,595,000	6,463,530	80	8	12	32,131,770	31.601.012	102.69	N	24
25. Portland, Ore.[19]	301,815	26,992,441	9,574,118	21,070,000	57,636,559	9,028,301	44	...	56	48,608,258	32,590,897	107.98	7,120,710	25
GROUP III														
Pop. 100,000 to 300,000														
26. Houston, Texas	292,352	33.964,250	11,908,500	1,617,000	47,489,750	4,516,985	72	28	...	42,972,765	41,355,765	141.46	N	26
27. Toledo, Ohio	290,718	26,262,500	13,338,000	1,223,000	40.823,500	988.000	100	...	...	39,835,500	38,612,500	132.82	986,945	27
28. Columbus, Ohio[20]	290,564	20,241,390	9,438,002	9,601,000	39,280,392	12,232,254	50	29	21	27,048,138	21,379,555	72.32	7,803,685	28
29. Denver, Colo.[21]	287.861	3,000,000	9,359.500	34,567,200	46,926.700	497,294	66	...	34	46,429,406	25,641,841	89.08	1,465,800	29
30. Oakland, Calif.[22]	284,063	3,583,637	12,326,666	45,334,000	61,244,303	N	...	...	...	61,244,303	22.894,303	80.60	36,626,298	30
31. St. Paul, Minn.	271,606	18,711,600	10,670,000	6,951,000	36,332,600	5,737,866	83	...	17	30,594,734	24,646,259	90.74	7,400,000	31

Columbia University
The Libraries
Columbia College
Rare Book Collection

BONDED DEBT OF 277 CITIES AS AT JANUARY 1, 1933—(Continued)

City	Census 1930	Gross Bonded Debt				Sinking Fund				Net Bonded Debt				
		General Improvement	Public School	Public Utility	Total	Total	General improvement (per cent)	Public school (per cent)	Public utility (per cent)	Total	Excluding self-supporting	Per capita excluding self-supporting	Total gross special assessment debt	No.
32. Atlanta, Ga.	270,366	6,489,000	5,695,500	3,004,000	15,188,500	2,307,204	61	13	26	12,881,296	10,477,390	38.75	928,900	32
33. Dallas, Tex.	260,475	19,141,000	7,795,250	9,583,000	36,519,250	2,609,156	52	15	33	34,450,094	25,555,478	98.11	N	33
34. Birmingham, Ala.	259,678	10,089,000	10,098,000	100,000	20,287,000	1,443,865	...	...	...	18,843,135	18,743,135	72.18	4,914,000	34
35. Akron, Ohio	255,040	20,947,165	9,395,214	10,678,600	41,020,979	2,016,383	14	22	64	39,004,596	29,622,306	116.15	7,405,643	35
36. Memphis, Tenn.	253,143	16,017,000	6,718,000	6,820,000	29,555,000	2,796,957	25	24	51	26,758,043	21,353,380	84.35	853,000	36
37. Providence, R. I.	252,981	23,901,000	14,630,000	19,500,000	58,031,000	16,433,174	50	17	33	41,597,826	27,567,809	108.97	N	37
38. San Antonio, Texas	231,542	17,510,500	7,396,000	6,576,000	31,482,500	1,338,108	51	41	8	30,144,392	23,678,672	102.27	.....	38
39. Omaha, Neb.[23]	214,006	14,163,462	9,028,250	8,915,000	32,106,712	5,739,151	17	13	70	26,367,561	21,453,959	100.25	5,645,500	39
40. Syracuse, N. Y.	209,326	16,885,725	9,776,440	6,495,625	33,157,790	N	...	...	...	33,157,790	26,662,165	127.37	3,962,000	40
41. Dayton, Ohio[24]	200,982	10,335,680	8,351,679	5,131,000	23,818,359	2,187,233	62	...	38	21,631,126	17,331,107	86.23	1,298,658	41
42. Worcester, Mass.	195,311	7,141,000	830,000	4,039,800	12,010,800	864,879	56	...	44	11,145,921	7,484,449	38.32	N	42
43. Oklahoma City, Okla.	185,389	12,430,800	6,928,170	6,428,600	25,787,570	8,861,747	44	20	36	16,925,823	13,658,623	73.68	6,503,985	43
44. Richmond, Va.[25]	182,929	24,855,642	6,184,438	7,155,550	38,195,438	10,539,237	73	14	13	27,656,393	21,880,490	119.61	N	44
45. Youngstown, Ohio	170,002	Not reporting												45
46. Grand Rapids, Mich.	168,592	7,971,500	4,054,314	3,080,000	15,105,814	2,286,206	56	...	44	12,819,608	10,733,958	63.67	2,659,200	46
47. Hartford, Conn.	164,072	12,267,000	7,865,965	3,940,000	24,072,965	4,364,141	61	26	13	19,708,824	16,319,114	99.46	N	47
48. Fort Worth, Texas	163,447	16,074,471	4,602,000	5,827,000	26,503,471	2,937,427	41	31	28	23,566,044	18,560,445	113.56	N	48
49. New Haven, Conn.	162,655	14,947,000	498,000	N	15,445,000	890,796	96	4	...	14,554,204	14,554,204	89.48	N	49
50. Flint, Mich.[26]	156,492	8,569,500	2,578,500	8,263,500	19,411,500	2,014,163	26	36	38	17,397,337	15,581,173	99.57	2,843,000	50
51. Nashville, Tenn.[27]	153,866	11,550,000	1,408,000	3,663,000	16,621,000	1,401,515	...	...	...	15,220,485	11,654,485	75.74	N	51
52. Springfield, Mass.	149,900	7,383,900	2,374,600	7,490,000	17,248,500	N	...	...	...	17,248,500	9,758,500	65.10	N	52
53. San Diego, Calif.	147,995	4,112,941	5,001,500	11,182,734	20,297,175	N	...	...	...	20,297,175	20,297,175	137.15	.....	53
54. Bridgeport, Conn.	147,716	9,936,000	4,332,710	N	14,268,710	N	...	...	...	14,268,710	14,268,710	96.60	N	54
55. Scranton, Pa.	143,433	2,358,000	6,661,000	N	9,019,000	853,268	10	90	...	8,165,732	8,165,732	56.93	950,419	55
56. Des Moines, Ia.	142,559	5,053,300	5,533,000	7,692,500	18,278,800	647,099	...	...	100	17,631,701	12,745,800	89.41	.....	56
57. Long Beach, Calif.[28]	142,032	11,191,466	7,491,250	6,770,000	25,452,716	N	...	...	...	25,452,716	18,682,716	131.54	.....	57
58. Tulsa, Okla.	141,258	11,322,891	6,226,837	5,811,000	23,360,728	2,736,314	34	66	...	20,624,414	14,813,414	104.87	.....	58
59. Salt Lake City, Utah	140,267	3,951,500	4,701,000	4,645,500	13,298,000	N	...	...	...	13,298,000	8,652,500	61.69	.....	59
60. Paterson, N. J.	138,513	10,176,364	7,766,000	13,001,000	30,943,364	2,614,295	61	39	...	28,329,069	15,328,069	110.66	350,000	60
61. Yonkers, N. Y.	134,646	17,667,950	10,422,950	4,159,250	32,250,150	N	...	...	...	32,250,150	28,090,900	208.63	3,262,000	61
62. Norfolk, Va.[29]	129,710	19,188,702	6,034,627	14,435,771	39,659,100	8,005,390	60	...	40	31,653,710	20,360,953	156.97	N	62
63. Jacksonville, Fla.[30]	129,549	8,156,500	4,259,000	2,822,500	15,238,000	315,625	2	98	...	14,922,375	12,254,875	94.60	1,220,000	63
64. Albany, N. Y.	127,413	11,252,675	5,750,850	12,983,500	29,987,025	1,955,472	88	...	12	28,031,553	15,276,264	119.90	3,120,000	64
65. Trenton, N. J.	123,356	10,895,060	7,896,550	844,000	19,635,610	3,141,078	54	27	19	16,494,532	16,217,501	131.47	355,000	65
66. Kansas City, Kans.[31]	121,857	3,874,909	1,787,000	6,278,500	11,940,409	2,412,194	...	18	82	9,528,215	5,239,270	43.00	989,257	66
67. Chattanooga, Tenn.[32]	119,798	13,604,500	.....	N	13,604,500	218,300	...	...	N	13,386,200	13,386,200	111.74	1,250,000	67
68. Camden, N. J.	118,700	15,404,675	4,120,000	1,628,605	21,153,280	2,679,295	62	27	11	18,473,985	18,473,985	155.64	1,726,000	68
69. Erie, Pa.[33]	115,967	6,049,000	5,208,000	1,732,000	12,989,000	739,093	61	...	39	12,249,907	10,805,401	93.17	1,233,320	69
70. Spokane, Wash.	115,514	2,542,600	1,209,000	770,000	4,521,600	203,720	15	25	60	4,317,880	3,669,435	31.77	1,548,016	70
71. Fall River, Mass.	115,274	7,172,000	2,491,500	451,000	10,114,500	1,076,000	80	...	20	9,038,500	8,802,500	76.36	N	71
72. Fort Wayne, Ind.	114,946	971,100	3,306,000	2,379,000	6,656,100	N	...	...	...	6,656,100	4,277,100	37.21	N	72
73. Elizabeth, N. J.	114,589	2,227,750	5,960,350	4,874,000	13,062,100	685,987	...	...	...	12,376,113	12,376,113	108.00	4,517,439	73
74. Cambridge, Mass.[34]	113,643	10,706,750	.....	1,326,000	12,032,750	3,078,154	85	...	15	8,954,596	8,078,475	71.09	N	74

BONDED DEBT OF 277 CITIES AS AT JANUARY 1, 1933—(Continued)

City	Census 1930	Gross Bonded Debt: General Improvement	Gross Bonded Debt: Public School	Gross Bonded Debt: Public Utility	Gross Bonded Debt: Total	Sinking Fund: Total	Sinking Fund: General improvement (per cent)	Sinking Fund: Public school (per cent)	Sinking Fund: Public utility (per cent)	Net Bonded Debt: Total	Net Bonded Debt: Excluding self-supporting	Net Bonded Debt: Per capita excluding self-supporting	Total gross special assessment debt	No.
75. New Bedford, Mass.	112,597	4,822,000	2,445,000	1,191,000	8,458,000	756,796	...	...	...	7,701,204	7,701,204	68.40	N	75
76. Reading, Pa.	111,171	4,135,000	5,699,400	834,000	10,668,400	244,010	43	43	14	10,424,390	9,625,390	86.58	713,000	76
77. Wichita, Kans.	111,110	4,883,087	1,572,500	N	6,455,587	N	...	...	...	6,455,587	6,455,587	58.10	2,721,083	77
78. Miami, Fla.[35]	110,637	19,592,000	6,704,000	3,114,000	29,410,000	123,660	8	92	...	29,286,340	27,197,340	245.82	7,842,000	78
79. Tacoma, Wash.[36]	106,817	2,651,000	2,041,000	12,643,495	17,335,495	668,955	71	...	29	16,666,540	4,219,911	39.51	1,913,290	79
80. Wilmington, Del.[37]	106,597	6,217,900	931,000	7,262,000	14,410,900	1,137,075	97	...	3	13,273,825	8,661,825	81.26	N	80
81. Knoxville, Tenn.[38]	105,802	15,347,006	2,420,000	4,654,833	22,421,839	1,454,596	87	...	13	20,967,243	16,497,580	155.93	2,007,202	81
82. Peoria Ill.	104,969	1,349,000	298,000	N	1,647,000	N	...	...	...	1,647,000	1,647,000	15.69	1,576,785	82
83. Canton, Ohio	104,906	5,791,637	5,713,000	1,163,600	12,668,237	2,744,345	79	21	...	9,923,892	8,760,292	83.51	2,205,581	83
84. South Bend, Ind.	104,193	1,720,000	3,477,500	890,000	6,087,500	139,883	28	...	72	5,947,617	5,158,901	49.51	5,060,494	84
85. Somerville, Mass.	103,908	1,343,000	2,283,000	N	3,626,000	N	...	...	...	3,626,000	3,626,000	34.90	N	85
86. El Paso, Texas	102,421	4,755,000	2,883,000	1,935,000	9,573,000	1,232,914	47	39	14	8,340,086	6,571,851	64.17	624,000	86
87. Lynn, Mass.[39]	102,320	6,761,800	.....	590,500	7,352,300	201,165	...	...	...	7,151,135	6,560,655	64.12	N	87
88. Evansville, Ind.	102,249	1,000,200	2,327,500	1,429,000	4,756,700	45,889	100	...	...	4,710,811	3,281,811	32.10	565,781	88
89. Utica, N. Y.	101,740	9,347,853	1,498,004	N	10,845,857	851,493	...	...	...	9,994,364	9,994,364	98.23	694,278	89
90. Duluth, Minn.	101,463	5,696,891	3,570,000	2,084,442	11,351,333	N	...	...	...	11,351,333	8,266,891	81.48	551,000	90
91. Tampa, Fla.	101,161	Not reporting												91
92. Gary, Ind.	100,426	2,441,297	3,500,000*	N	5,941,297	25,228	100	...	...	5,916,069	5,916,069	58.91	5,002,094	92
93. Lowell, Mass.[39]	100,234	4,559,130	.....	356,750	4,915,880	N	...	...	...	4,915,880	4,559,130	45.48	N	93
GROUP IV														
Pop. 50,000 to 100,000														
94. Waterbury, Conn.	99,902	7,476,000	1,567,000	7,472,000	16,515,000	164,272	100	...	...	16,350,728	8,878,728	88.87	N	94
95. Schenectady, N. Y.	95,692	5,568,800	2,804,100	630,000	9,002,900	142,113	...	...	...	8,860,787	8,230,787	86.01	2,064,974	95
96. Sacramento, Calif.	93,750	4,494,675	6,049,000	3,387,290	13,930,965	N	...	...	...	13,930,965	10,543,675	112.47	1,539,017	96
97. Allentown, Pa.	92,563	5,646,400	4,439,500	N	10,085,900	1,167,339	31	69	...	8,918,561	8,918,561	96.35	555,100	97
98. Bayonne, N. J.	88,979	3,476,178	4,016,500	3,714,000	11,206,678	208,836	...	100	...	10,997,842	7,283,842	81.86	N	98
99. Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	86,626	Not reporting												99
100. Rockford, Ill.	85,864	312,500	1,280,000	200,000	1,792,500	N	...	...	...	1,792,500	1,592,500	18.55	3,047,912	100
101. Lawrence, Mass.	85,068	3,072,650	1,338,500	220,000	4,761,150	49,341	...	...	100	4,581,809	4,411,150	51.85	N	101
102. Savannah, Ga.	85,024	Not reporting												102
103. Charlotte, N. C.	86,675	Not reporting												103
104. Berkeley, Calif.	82,109	Not reporting												104
105. Altoona, Pa.	82,054	1,397,000	4,666,500	1,448,000	7,511,500	1,363,771	38	27	35	6,147,729	5,181,550	63.15	1,257,700	105
106. Little Rock, Ark.	81,679	Not reporting												106
107. St. Joseph, Mo.	80,935	3,999,000	2,567,000	N	6,566,000	181,784	14	86	...	6,384,216	6,384,216	78.88	227,552	107
108. Saginaw, Mich.	80,715	906,000	1,418,000	3,252,000	5,576,000	321,538	7	30	63	5,254,462	4,254,462	52.71	1,577,000	108
109. Harrisburg, Pa.	80,339	2,248,000	1,415,000	50,000	3,713,000	597,200	82	18	...	3,115,800	3,065,800	38.72		109
110. Sioux City, Ia.	79,183	Not reporting												110
111. Lansing, Mich.[41]	78,397	2,279,000	N	3,799,000	6,078,000	1,150,577	16	...	84	4,927,423	2,100,738	26.80	368,064	111
112. Pawtucket, R. I.	77,149	Not reporting												112
113. Manchester, N. H.	76,834	2,848,590	1,338,410	94,000	4,281,000	N	...	...	...	4,281,000	4,187,000	54.49	N	113
114. Binghamton, N. Y.	76,662	2,749,207	3,881,375	65,000	6,695,582	126,672	100	...	...	6,568,910	6,503,910	84.84	N	114

BONDED DEBT OF 277 CITIES AS AT JANUARY 1, 1933—(Continued)

City	Census 1930	Gross Bonded Debt			Sinking Fund				Net Bonded Debt			Total gross special assessment debt	No.
		General Improvement	Public School	Public Utility	Total	Total	General improvement (per cent)	Public school (per cent)	Public utility (per cent)	Total	Excluding self-supporting	Per capita excluding self-supporting		
115. Shreveport, La.	76,655	4,848,000	1,545,000	3,236,000	9,629,000	N	...	...	...	9,629,000	9,204,000	120.07	75,000	115
116. Pasadena, Calif.[41]	76,086	4,365,800	4,075,000	2,159,800	10,600,600	164,504	43	...	57	10,436,096	8,369,488	110.00	3,422,444	116
117. Lincoln, Neb.[42]	75,933	775,148	3,984,239	1,605,000	6,364,387	321,940	52	...	48	6,042,447	4,593,154	60.49	1,692,107	117
118. Huntington, W. Va.	75,572	1,923,000	1,176,500	N	3,099,500	539,942	99	1	...	2,559,558	2,559,558	33.87	N	118
119. Niagara Falls, N. Y.	75,460	5,845,000	5,760,129	1,816,530	13,421,659	281,584	...	...	100	13,140,075	11,605,129	153.79	1,298,990	119
120. Winston-Salem, N. C.	75,274	6,437,227	3,628,000	2,984,333	13,049,560	321,883	100	...	...	12,727,677	9,743,344	129.44	3,823,440	120
121. East St. Louis, Ill.	74,347	Not reporting												121
122. Troy, N. Y.	72,763	3,900,233	1,493,750	1,052,075	6,446,058	N	...	...	...	6,446,058	5,393,983	74.13	N	122
123. Quincy, Mass.	71,983	2,278,000	2,160,000	539,000	4,977,000	N	...	...	...	4,977,000	4,438,000	61.65	N	123
124. Springfield, Ill.[41]	71,864	206,000	215,000	2,765,000	3,186,000	52,118	100	...	...	3,133,882	368,882	5.13	735,600	124
125. Portland, Me.	70,810	Not reporting												125
126. Lakewood, Ohio	70,509	2,751,920	3,617,500	173,500	6,542,920	623,822	100	...	...	5,919,098	5,919,098	83.95	280,085	126
127. Roanoke, Va.	69,206	5,344,000	2,650,000	N	7,994,000	1,229,059	100	...	...	6,764,941	6,764,941	97.75	N	127
128. Springfield, Ohio	68,743	3,686,542	1,796,500	470,000	5,953,042	554,447	92	8	...	5,398,595	4,928,595	71.70	895,301	128
129. Mobile, Ala.	68,202	2,768,000	990,000	1,940,000	5,698,000	1,394,518	98	2	...	4,303,482	3,499,482	51.31	4,303,000	129
130. New Britain, Conn.[43]	68,128	1,986,000	3,425,000	1,881,000	7,292,000	593,788	30	14	56	6,698,212	5,152,978	75.64	N	130
131. East Orange, N. J.	68,020	5,467,500	3,378,245	1,618,000	10,463,745	1,650,067	11	27	62	8,813,678	8,315,436	122.25	1,411,000	131
132. Racine, Wis.	67,542	2,470,000	1,708,000	150,000	4,328,000	326,000	53	47	...	4,002,000	3,852,000	57.03	N	132
133. Johnstown, Pa.	66,993	4,341,000	3,749,000	N	8,090,000	713,506	72	28	...	7,376,494	7,376,494	110.11	N	133
134. Cicero, Ill.	66,602	2,485,000*	3,250,250	.....	5,735,250	N	...	...	...	5,735,250	5,735,250	86.11	.....	134
135. Atlantic City, N. J.	66,198	22,147,000	3,807,000	2,500,000	28,454,000	2,614,025	58	19	23	25,839,975	23,931,651	361.52	N	135
136. Montgomery, Ala.	66,079	Not reporting												136
137. Newton, Mass.	65,276	Not reporting												137
138. Covington, Ky.	65,252	1,112,900	780,000	2,008,000	3,900,900	N	...	...	...	3,900,900	1,892,900	29.01	N	138
139. Pontiac, Mich.	64,928	4,017,950	3,962,975	1,581,500	9,562,425	898,954	...	96	4	8,663,471	7,118,075	109.63	1,921,600	139
140. Hammond, Ind.	64,560	Not reporting												140
141. Topeka, Kans.	64,120	1,693,354	1,717,000	765,200	4,175,554	200,691	...	...	100	3,974,863	3,410,354	53.19	1,361,819	141
142. Oak Park, Ill.	63,982	Not reporting												142
143. Brockton, Mass.	63,797	1,235,500	335,750	1,218,100	2,789,350	328,718	...	...	100	2,460,632	1,571,250	24.63	N	143
144. Evanston, Ill.	63,338	507,000	4,091,000	197,000	4,795,000	N	...	...	...	4,795,000	4,598,000	72.59	3,426,459	144
145. Passaic, N. J.	62,959	5,877,500	2,288,250	7,684,000	15,849,750	981,396	65	35	...	14,868,354	7,184,354	114.11	103,992	145
146. Terre Haute, Ind.	62,810	1,113,000	1,270,000	N	2,383,000	62,617	90	10	...	2,320,383	2,320,383	36.94	N	146
147. Glendale, Calif.	62,736	1,552,750	4,631,000	455,500	6,639,250	N	...	...	...	6,639,250	6,183,750	98.57	169,960	147
148. Charleston, S. C.	62,265	Not reporting												148
149. Wheeling, W. Va.	61,659	1,150,500	N	1,645,000	2,795,500	18,607	100	...	...	2,776,893	2,776,893	45.04	N	149
150. Mount Vernon, N. Y.	61,499	7,764,000	5,439,050	2,588,000	15,791,050	1,686,101	51	...	49	14,104,949	12,339,757	200.65	482,000	150
151. Davenport, Ia.	60,751	1,538,000	1,103,000	N	2,641,000	61,222	...	...	...	2,579,778	2,579,778	42.46	473,913	151
152. Charleston, W. Va.[44]	60,408	1,032,000	2,377,000	.....	3,409,000	665,742	47	53	...	2,743,258	2,743,258	45.41	.....	152
153. Augusta, Ga.[45]	60,342	1,994,000	457,600	416,000	2,867,600	214,340	65	...	35	2,653,260	2,310,327	38.29	.....	153
154. Lancaster, Pa.	59,949	4,554,000	3,390,000	.....	7,944,000	908,720	22	78	...	7,035,280	7,035,280	117.35	.....	154
155. Medford, Mass.	59,714	1,666,000	1,798,500	423,000	3,887,500	34,954	100	...	...	3,852,546	3,429,546	57.43	.....	155
156. Hoboken, N. J.	59,261	4,976,787	3,466,635	267,000	8,710,422	1,640,956	46	49	5	7,069,466	6,884,629	116.17	70,000	156
157. Chester, Pa.	59,164	3,905,000	2,195,000	N	6,100,000	1,261,365	42	58	...	4,838,635	4,838,635	81.78	401,300	157

BONDED DEBT OF 277 CITIES AS AT JANUARY 1, 1933—(Continued)

City	Census 1930	Gross Bonded Debt: General Improvement	Gross Bonded Debt: Public School	Gross Bonded Debt: Public Utility	Gross Bonded Debt: Total	Sinking Fund: Total	Sinking Fund: General improvement (per cent)	Sinking Fund: Public school (per cent)	Sinking Fund: Public utility (per cent)	Net Bonded Debt: Total	Net Bonded Debt: Excluding self-supporting	Net Bonded Debt: Per capita excluding self-supporting	Total gross special assessment debt	No.
158. Union City, N. J.	58,659	3,315,000	2,671,000	N	5,986,000	952,459	...	...	...	5,033,541	5,033,541	85.81	.....	158
159. Malden, Mass.	58,036	Not reporting												159
160. Madison, Wis.	57,899	2,698,500	3,119,000	357,000	6,174,500	N	...	...	...	6,174,500	5,817,500	100.48	1,196,600	160
161. Bethlehem, Pa.	57,892	2,533,400	3,494,000	1,268,000	7,295,400	1,513,522	36	60	4	5,781,878	4,568,067	78.91	78,000	161
162. Beaumont, Tex.[46]	57,732	5,070,500	2,385,138	2,674,000	10,129,638	847,600	35	22	43	9,282,038	8,589,038	148.77	N	162
163. San Jose, Calif.	57,651	932,275	555,000	N	932,275	N	.	.	...	1,487,275	1,487,275	25.80	130,000	163
164. Springfield, Mo.	57,527	855,000	1,841,500	N	2,696,500	242,826	52	48	...	2,453,674	2,453,674	42.65	N	164
165. Decatur, Ill.	57,510	1,390,000	1,151,150	.....	2,541,150	275,386	...	100	...	2,265,764	2,265,764	39.40	.....	165
166. Irvington, N. J.	56,733	3,707,431	4,128,150	N	7,835,581	454,005	73	27	...	7,381,576	7,381,576	130.11	646,744	166
167. Holyoke, Mass.[47]	56,537	2,395,500	.	1,685,000	4,080,500	N	.	.	...	4,080,500	2,395,500	42.37	N	167
168. Hamtramck, Mich.	56,268	3,011,542	3,547,500	523,000	7,082,042	964,727	48	52	...	6,117,315	6,117,315	108.72	83,390	168
169. Cedar Rapids, Ia.	56,097	1,941,800	1,463,000	825,000	4,229,800	320,929	.	.	100	3,908,871	3,083,871	54.97	N	169
170. York, Pa.	55,254	1,385,500	2,054,000	N	3,439,500	476,971	79	21	...	2,962,529	2,962,529	53.62	56,400	170
171. Jackson, Mich.	55,187	1,734,729	2,186,000	1,079,375	5,000,104	N	...	.	...	5,000,104	3,920,729	71.04	390,000	171
172. Kalamazoo, Mich.[41]	54,786	298,500	2,141,000	19,500	2,459,000	97,135	7	93	...	2,361,865	2,342,365	42.75	546,400	172
173. East Chicago, Ind.	54,784	1,199,000	1,497,000	2,371,000	5,067,000	237,492	4	.	96	4,829,507	2,686,737	49.04	1,079,046	173
174. McKeesport, Pa.	54,632	1,335,108	1,652,000	285,000	3,272,108	98,166	4	96	...	3,173,942	2,888,942	52.88	545,751	174
175. New Rochelle, N. Y.	54,000	9,072,700	6,691,676	N	15,764,376	476,407	100	...	...	15,287,969	15,287,969	283.82	225,344	175
176. Macon, Ga.	53,829	920,000	1,176,000	.....	2,096,000	N	...	...	...	2,096,000	2,096,000	38.94	.....	176
177. Greensboro, N. C.	53,569	Not reporting												177
178. Austin, Texas	53,120	4,201,000	1,228,250	803,000	6,232,250	100,000	...	.	...	6,132,250	4,628,250	87.13	N	178
179. Highland Park, Mich.	52,959	2,668,400	3,535,000	1,158,126	7,361,526	3,009,303	75	25	...	4,352,223	3,194,097	60.31	45,700	179
180. Galveston, Texas[48]	52,938	6,872,500	1,696,000	684,500	9,253,000	740,482	82	18	.	8,512,518	6,442,018	121.69	N	180
181. Waco, Texas	52,848	3,045,500	1,667,100	2,477,000	7,189,600	1,246,852	54	21	25	5,942,748	3,724,372	70.47	N	181
182. Fresno, Calif.	52,513	488,500	3,540,000	2,520,000	6,548,500	N	.	.	.	6,548,500	4,028,500	76.71	N	182
183. Hamilton, Ohio[49]	52,176	1,067,326	1,721,000	1,109,890	3,898,216	352,692	25	17	58	3,545,524	2,639,599	50.59	526,488	183
184. Durham, N. C.	52,037	3,902,213	1,798,621	4,028,000	9,728,834	25,579	100	.	.	9,699,255	5,671,255	107.54	1,750,526	184
185. Columbia, S. C.	51,581	2,116,000	1,494,188	687,000	4,297,188	348,063	16	58	26	3,949,125	3,353,350	65.01	161,000	185
186. Cleveland Hts., Ohio	50,945	1,671,373	6,905,000	96,287	8,672,660	948,074	55	45	...	7,724,586	7,628,299	149.74	2,058,664	186
187. Port Arthur, Texas	50,902	4,722,900	2,163,000	833,000	7,768,900	169,293	...	...	100	7,599,607	6,716,607	131.95	14,000	187
188. Dearborn, Mich.	50,358	9,594,300	8,557,200	2,385,000	20,536,500	3,621,659	75	10	15	16,914,841	15,062,590	299.11	1,325,300	188
189. Kenosha, Wis.	50,262	387,000	2,574,000	183,000	3,144,000	N	...	...	...	3,144,000	2,961,000	58.91	734,977	189
190. Asheville, N. C.	50,193	Not reporting												190
191. Pueblo, Colo.	50,096	710,000	1,490,000	1,395,000	3,595,000	164,498	11	9	80	3,430,502	2,168,672	43.29	1,399,300	191
GROUP V														
Pop. 30,000 to 50,000														
192. Pittsfield, Mass.	49,677	504,400	1,203,000	470,000	2,177,400	N	...	...	...	2,177,400	1,707,400	34.37	221,000	192
193. Woonsocket, R. I.	49,376	Not reporting												193
194. Haverhill, Mass.	48,710	834,000	189,000	239,000	1,262,000	22,000	100	...	...	1,240,000	1,001,000	20.55	N	194
195. New Castle, Pa.	48,674	925,000	2,235,000	N	3,160,000	176,635	61	39	...	2,983,365	2,983,365	61.29	265,231	195
196. Everett, Mass.	48,424	1,153,400	1,349,500	107,000	2,609,900	186,812	...	...	...	2,423,088	2,423,088	50.04	405,900	196
197. Jackson, Miss.[50]	48,282	4,102,400	.....	1,011,500	5,113,900	N	...	...	...	5,113,900	4,102,400	85.02	1,450,542	197

BONDED DEBT OF 277 CITIES AS AT JANUARY 1, 1933—(Continued)

City	Census 1930	Gross Bonded Debt				Sinking Fund				Net Bonded Debt				
		General Improvement	Public School	Public Utility	Total	Total	General improvement (per cent)	Public school (per cent)	Public utility (per cent)	Total	Excluding self-supporting	Per capita excluding self-supporting	Total gross special assessment debt	No.
198. Phoenix, Ariz.	48,118	2,546,500	1,600,000*	5,527,000	9,673,500	158,270	81	...	19	9,515,230	4,018,537	83.51	1,956,770	198
199. Stockton, Calif.	47,963	6,224,775	1,032,000	N	7,256,775	N	...	...	...	7,256,775	7,256,775	151.08	.....	199
200. Brookline, Mass.	47,490	1,067,000	1,295,000	322,000	2,684,000	N	...	...	...	2,684,000	2,362,000	49.74	N	200
201. Elmira, N. Y.	47,397	1,607,400	840,000	810,000	3,257,400	N	...	...	...	3,257,400	2,447,400	51.64	N	201
202. Bay City, Mich.	47,355	368,000	1,540,000	1,726,000	3,634,000	899,678	18	82	...	2,734,322	1,008,322	21.29	132,000	202
203. Berwyn, Ill.	47,027	Not reporting												203
204. Clifton, N. J.	46,875	3,357,000	2,212,400	4,777,000	10,346,400	141,387	53	47	...	10,205,013	5,428,013	115.80	1,153,471	204
205. Aurora, Ill.	46,589	Not reporting												205
206. Muncie, Ind.	46,548	Not reporting												206
207. Stamford, Conn.	46,346	Not reporting												207
208. Waterloo, Ia.	46,191	655,500	1,408,000	235,000	2,398,500	160,000	72	19	9	2,238,500	2,018,500	43.70	32,400	208
209. Chelsea, Mass.	45,816	1,485,650	684,500	86,000	2,256,150	383,416	...	...	...	1,872,734	1,786,734	39.00	N	209
210. Lexington, Ky.	45,736	1,159,570	683,000	N	1,842,570	434,920	82	18	...	1,407,650	1,407,650	30.78	176,034	210
211. Williamsport, Pa.	45,729	852,700	1,170,900	N	2,023,600	375,164	35	65	...	1,648,436	1,648,436	36.05	224,500	211
212. Portsmouth, Va.	45,704	5,475,100	748,000	2,950,000	9,173,100	1,700,773	32	...	68	7,472,327	5,671,943	124.10	N	212
213. Jamestown, N. Y.[51]	45,155	1,391,609	1,574,000	675,500	3,641,109	81,092	...	...	100	3,560,017	2,965,609	65.68	794,687	213
214. Lorain, Ohio	44,512	1,142,476	1,886,500	349,000	3,377,976	168,695	78	15	7	3,209,281	2,871,281	64.51	1,172,136	214
215. Chicopee, Mass.[41]	43,930	861,000	341,900	543,500	1,746,400	N	...	...	...	1,746,400	1,202,900	27.38	N	215
216. Wichita Falls, Texas	43,690	2,713,500	1,855,000	4,746,000	9,314,500	98,266	64	23	13	9,216,234	8,485,627	194.22	N	216
217. Battle Creek, Mich.	43,573	1,701,500	1,214,000	N	2,915,500	N	...	...	...	2,915,500	2,915,500	66.91	N	217
218. Perth Amboy, N. J.	43,516	2,318,500	1,879,000	2,551,000	6,748,500	884,805	10	41	49	5,863,695	3,740,602	85.96	562,600	218
219. Salem, Mass.	43,353	856,500	570,500	343,500	1,770,500	N	...	...	...	1,770,500	1,427,000	32.92	N	219
220. Amarillo, Texas	43,132	Not reporting												220
221. Columbus, Ga.	43,131	Not reporting												221
222. Joliet, Ill.	42,993	581,000	1,998,000	171,500	2,750,500	7,500	100	...	...	2,743,000	2,743,000	63.80	1,188,729	222
223. Cranston, R. I.	42,911	1,624,500	2,531,000	N	4,155,500	310,638	...	...	...	3,844,862	3,844,862	101.86	N	223
224. Portsmouth, Ohio	42,560	Not reporting												224
225. Lima, Ohio	42,287	Not reporting												225
226. Council Bluffs, Ia.	42,048	Not reporting												226
227. Montclair, N. J.	42,017	4,132,920	5,686,500	3,207,000	13,026,420	1,096,623	11	76	13	11,929,797	8,872,315	211.16	673,000	227
228. Dubuque, Ia.[53]	41,679	1,376,063	1,107,000	606,000	3,089,063	544,212	28	38	34	2,544,851	2,430,223	58.31	491,100	228
229. Muskegon, Mich.	41,390	2,000,000	2,606,348	389,500	4,995,848	338,500	87	...	13	4,657,348	4,311,448	104.71	611,000	229
230. Warren, Ohio	41,062	1,677,396	1,941,300	646,400	4,265,096	51,373	20	16	64	4,213,723	3,599,539	87.66	686,600	230
231. Kearney, N. J.	40,716	3,030,518	2,680,200	7,511,850	13,222,568	788,354	49	4	47	12,434,214	12,434,214	305.39	1,285,000	231
232. Fitchburg, Mass.	40,692	1,328,300	110,000	343,000	1,781,300	N	...	...	...	1,781,300	1,438,300	35.35	N	232
233. Lynchburg, Va.	40,661	2,749,567	1,136,738	1,853,667	5,739,972	1,566,023	71	...	29	4,173,949	2,770,282	68.13	N	233
234. St. Petersburg, Fla.[54]	40,425	7,066,600	.....	4,321,000	11,387,600	1,745,786	...	...	...	9,641,814	.....	.....	11,173,000	234
235. Poughkeepsie, N. Y.	40,288	1,478,000	1,581,950	615,000	3,674,950	86,524	92	8	...	3,588,426	2,973,426	73.80	439,363	235
236. Ogden, Utah	40,272	1,759,500	791,500	1,015,000	3,566,000	19,600	...	100	...	3,546,400	2,531,400	62.86	.....	236
237. Oshkosh, Wis.	40,108	498,000	753,000	233,000	1,484,000	N	...	...	...	1,484,000	1,251,000	31.19	N	237
238. Anderson, Ind.	39,804	522,302	740,500	11,000	1,273,802	N	...	...	...	1,273,802	1,262,802	31.73	740,152	238
239. E. Cleveland, Ohio	39,667	1,576,050	2,890,000	43,500	4,509,550	848,000	56	44	...	3,661,550	3,618,050	91.21	421,540	239
240. La Crosse, Wis.	39,614	442,000	523,000	81,000	1,046,000	3,500	...	...	100	1,042,500	965,000	24.27	224,594	240

BONDED DEBT OF 277 CITIES AS AT JANUARY 1, 1933—(Continued)

City	Census 1930	Gross Bonded Debt				Sinking Fund				Net Bonded Debt			Total gross special assessment debt	No.
		General Improvement	Public School	Public Utility	Total	Total	General improvement (per cent)	Public school (per cent)	Public utility (per cent)	Total	Excluding self-supporting	Per capita excluding self-supporting		
241. Butte, Mont.	39,532	Not reporting												241
242. Sheboygan, Wis.	39,251	167,000	444,000	200,000	811,000	N	...	...	...	811,000	611,000	15.57	206.157	242
243. Waltham, Mass.	39,247	Not reporting												243
244. Quincy, Ill.	39,241	N	510,000	132,000	642,000	N	...	...	...	642,000	510,000	13.00	841,500	244
245. Meriden, Conn.	38,481	905,000	1,169,000	292,000	2,366,000	N	...	...	...	2,366,000	2,074,000	53.90	N	245
246. Bloomfield, N. J.	38,077	2,347,000	2,815,500	1,358,500	6,521,000	123,440	68	...	32	6,397,560	5,079,060	133.39	1,002,000	246
247. Rock Island, Ill.	37,953	Not reporting												247
248. Cumberland, Md.	37,747	1,880,000	2,145,000	2,819,900	6,844,900	640,290	39	...	61	6,204,610	3,780,290	100.15	N	248
249. San Bernardino, Calif.	37,481	Not reporting												249
250. Green Bay, Wis.	37,415	623,900	1,255,500	878,000	2,757,400	N	...	...	...	2,757,400	1,879,000	50.22	N	250
251. Raleigh, N. C.	37,379	Not reporting												251
252. Taunton, Mass.[55]	37,355	478,400	726,000	937,000	2,141,400	240,555	...	...	100	1,900,845	1,204,400	32.24	334,000	252
253. Santa Monica, Calif.	37,146	2,018,500	1,797,000	1,301,000	5,116,500	N	...	...	...	5,116,500	3,815,500	102.72	.....	253
254. West New York, N. J.	37,107	1,626,168	2,209,000	.....	3,835,168	254,936	100	...	...	3,580,232	3,580,232	96.48	125,030	254
255. Hazleton, Pa.	36,765	1,995,000	1,267,000	.....	3,262,000	106,766	...	100	...	3,155,234	3,155,234	85.82	N	255
256. Danville, Ill.	36,765	176,450	529,700	N	706,150	N	...	...	...	706,150	706,150	19.21	586,106	256
257. High Point, N. C.[41]	36,745	2,029,000	1,091,000	2,158,000	5,278,000	360,119	...	...	...	4,917,881	2,759,881	75.11	2,752,000	257
258. Auburn, N. Y.	36,652	1,157,160	685,000	196,000	2,038,160	N	...	...	...	2,038,160	1,842,160	50.26	285,024	258
259. Zanesville, Ohio	36,440	622,365	749,614	380,500	1,752,479	343,310	59	41	...	1,409,169	1,028,669	28.23	205,815	259
260. Superior, Wis.	36,113	793,000	1,348,800	.....	2,141,800	68,705	14	86	...	2,073,095	2,073,095	57.41	.....	260
261. Arlington, Mass.	36,094	536,500	1,075,000	258,000	1,869,500	126,096	100	...	...	1,743,404	1,485,000	41.14	N	261
262. Norwalk, Conn.	36,019	Not reporting												262
263. Elgin, Ill.	35,929	779,264	270,000	75,000	1,144,264	10,812	...	...	100	1,133,452	1,069,264	29.76	1,194,736	263
264. Norristown, Pa.	35,853	980,000	1,504,500	N	2,484,500	520,608	19	81	...	1,963,892	1,963,892	54.78	N	264
265. White Plains, N. Y.	35,830	5,250,129	7,306,000	1,837,800	14,393,929	161,613	30	4	66	14,232,316	12,501,468	348.91	197,400	265
266. Revere, Mass.	35,680	619,000	869,000	264,000	1,752,000	N	...	...	...	1,752,000	1,488,000	41.70	N	266
267. Steubenville, Ohio	35,422	Not reporting												267
268. Orange, N. J.	35,399	2,451,136	1,800,000*	380,000	4,631,136	1,236,674	52	26	22	3,394,462	3,274,367	92.50	80,117	268
269. Alameda, Calif.	35,033	216,995	478,375	91,580	786,970	N	...	...	...	786,970	695,390	19.85	118,098	269
270. Lewiston, Me.	34,948	648,500	535,000	378,000	1,561,500	225,000	100	...	...	1,336,500	1,336,500	38.24	N	270
271. Watertown, Mass.	34,913	603,000	1,103,000	36,000	1,742,000	N	...	...	...	1,742,000	1,706,000	48.86	N	271
272. Amsterdam, N. Y.	34,817	591,320	2,106,150	69,000	2,766,470	166,433	88	8	4	2,600,037	2,537,437	72.88	47,560	272
273. West Allis, Wis.	34,671	977,400	1,231,000	314,000	2,522,400	N	...	...	...	2,522,400	2,522,400	72.75	1,220,788	273
274. New Brunswick, N. J.	34,555	1,794,000	1,414,000	1,240,000	4,448,000	N	...	...	...	4,448,000	3,208,000	92.84	373,000	274
275. Easton, Pa.	34,468	Not reporting												275
276. Plainfield, N. J.	34,422	2,687,000	2,040,000	N	4,727,000	213,671	...	...	...	4,513,329	4,513,329	131.12	426,000	276
277. Newport News, Va.	34,417	2,374,500	1,006,500	3,102,000	6,483,000	677,201	...	...	...	5,805,799	2,703,799	78.56	N	277
278. Santa Barbara, Calif.	33,613	1,532,925	2,209,625	673,250	4,415,800	79,504	73	...	27	4,336,296	3,663,046	106.90	N	278
279. Paducah, Ky.	33,541	1,530,500	271,000	2,276,000	4,077,500	260,685	76	24	...	3,816,815	1,540,815	45.94	1,030,169	279
280. Mansfield, Ohio	33,525	809,780	1,007,000	149,000	1,965,780	132,667	...	...	...	1,833,113	1,684,113	50.23	259,225	280
281. Waukegan, Ill.	33,499	Not reporting												281
282. Norwood, Ohio	33,411	1,297,935	1,207,500	229,500	2,734,935	552,087	...	...	...	2,182,848	1,953,348	58.46	78,395	282
283. Sioux Falls, S. Dak.[41]	33,362	665,000	1,382,000	290,000	2,337,000	1,133,649	9	80	11	1,203,351	1,051,643	31.52	N	283
284. Colorado Springs, Colo.[41]	33,237	655,000	1,002,000	2,039,000	3,696,000	218,000	31	...	69	3,478,000	1,589,000	47.81	270,300	284

BONDED DEBT OF 277 CITIES AS AT JANUARY 1, 1933—(Continued)

City	Census 1930	Gross Bonded Debt				Sinking Fund				Net Bonded Debt				
		General Improvement	Public School	Public Utility	Total	Total	General improvement (per cent)	Public school (per cent)	Public utility (per cent)	Total	Excluding self-supporting	Per capita excluding self-supporting	Total gross special assessment debt	No.
285. Elkhart, Ind.	32,949	148,000	770,000	1,222,000	2,140,000	133,457	24	37	39	2,006,543	837,570	25.42	N	285
286. Kokomo, Ind.	32,843	Not reporting												286
287. Laredo, Texas	32,618	794,000	419,000	N	1,213,000	137,819	62	38	...	1,075,181	1,075,181	32.96	N	287
288. Tucson, Ariz.	32,506	1,796,783	.....	939,000	2,735,783	652,413	...	...	...	2,083,370	2,083,370	....	825,300	288
289. Richmond, Ind.	32,493	261,000	660,000	.....	921,000	N	...	...	...	921,000	921,000	28.34	.....	289
290. Rome, N. Y.	32,338	527,167	818,000	166,000	1,511,167	N	...	...	...	1,511,167	1,345,167	41.60	214,628	290
291. Wilmington, N. C.	32,270	2,110,505	1,100,000*	985,995	4,196,500	N	...	...	...	4,196,500	3,210,505	99.49	.....	291
292. Moline, Ill.	32,236	Not reporting												292
293. Watertown, N. Y.	32,205	994,535	1,519,900	878,000	3,392,435	208,286	55	45	...	3,184,149	2,306,149	71.61	128,254	293
294. Muskogee, Okla.	32,026	2,267,093	1,202,800	724,000	4,193,893	2,464,755	51	24	25	1,729,138	1,616,421	50.47	450,000	294
295. Meridian, Miss.	31,954	Not reporting												295
296. Pensacola, Fla.	31,597	2,602,000	576,000	350,000	3,528,000	603,752	99	1	...	2,924,248	2,924,248	92.60	172,500	296
297. Nashua, N. H.	31,463	1,179,500	484,500	N	1,664,000	294,112	...	...	...	1,369,888	1,369,888	43.54	N	297
298. Fort Smith, Ark.	31,429	Not reporting												298
299. Port Huron, Mich.	31,361	1,082,104	572,000	223,000	1,877,104	29,458	63	37	...	1,847,646	1,624,646	51.80	387,758	299
300. Newburgh, N. Y.	31,275	882,421	1,153,767	706,731	2,742,919	79,019	100	...	...	2,663,900	1,957,170	62.58	543,012	300
301. Marion, Ohio	31,084	Not reporting												301
302. Bloomington, Ill.	30,930	Not reporting												302
303. Hagerstown, Md.[56]	30,861	2,376,000	642,500	2,906,000	5,924,500	N	...	...	...	5,924,500	3,018,500	97.81	N	303
304. Bellingham, Wash.[46]	30,823	542,000	N	358,000	900,000	N	...	...	...	900,000	542,000	17.58	609,700	304
305. Baton Rouge, La.	30,729	Not reporting												305
306. Newark, Ohio	30,596	758,480	901,400	339,000	1,998,880	179,592	39	...	61	1,818,288	1,607,643	52.54	364,440	306
307. Everett, Wash.	30,567	183,000	377,000	3,170,000	3,730,000	494,320	41	3	56	3,235,680	1,541,480	50.43	N	307
308. Santa Ana, Calif.	30,322	568,490	1,616,000	568,490	2,360,725	83,600	23	69	8	2,277,125	2,184,490	72.04	1,545,656	308
309. Alton, Ill.	30,151	280,000	.. ....	N	280,000	N	...	...	...	280,000	280,000	....	637,900	309
Canadian Cities														
1. Montreal, Que.	818,577	Not reporting												1
2. Toronto, Ont.[57]	626,674	58,275,169	28,856,881	92,749,179	179,881,229	24,158,111	29	22	49	155,723,118	74,919,427	119.55	17,598,632	2
3. Vancouver, B. C.	246,593	42,914,075	10,398,176	6,017,258	59,329,509	14,474,124	74	17	9	44,855,385	40,208,578	163.91	8,252,965	3
4. Winnipeg, Man.[58]	218,785	9,955,180	8,250,000	36,505,057	54,710,237	19,658,402	32	14	54	35,051,835	9,423,888	43.07	11,860,150	4
5. Hamilton, Ont.[59]	153,507	13,565,224	5,816,611	8,952,814	28,334,649	3,105,987	42	13	45	25,228,662	17,691,551	115.25	2,143,946	5
6. Quebec, Que.	130,594	19,273,636	5,104,000	7,295,632	31,673,268	2,709,388	51	36	13	28,963,880	22,025,993	168.66	.....	6
7. Ottawa, Ont.[59]	126,872	10,484,095	4,092,027	6,147,011	20,723,133	5,517,719	45	18	37	15,205,414	11,092,312	88.75	2,374,019	7
8. Calgary, Alta.[60]	83,761	10,720,009	3,026,700	11,025,689	24,772,398	11,309,650	56	...	44	13,462,748	7,383,207	88.15	4,572,459	8
9. Edmonton, Alta.[61]	79,197	21,694,377	4,159,135	10,639,804	36,493,316	11,842,486	50	5	45	24,650,830	19,331,446	245.23	4,520,927	9
10. London, Ont.[62]	71,148	3,441,072	3,152,925	4,352,503	10,946,500	1,912,411	...	...	...	9,034,089	5,442,726*	76.50	1,894,605	10
11. Windsor, Ont.[63]	63,108	5,956,646	4,249,348	3,200,478	13,406,472	247,698	...	53	47	13,158,774	10,073,592	160.01	.....	11
12. Verdun, Que.[64]	60,745	6,842,400		300,000	7,142,000	1,378,708	92	...	8	5,763,692	.....	....	1,667,000	12
13. Halifax, N. S.	59,275	Not reporting												13
14. Regina, Sask.[65]	53,209	5,768,755	3,028,346	6,870,507	15,667,608	5,932,792	40	15	45	9,734,816	5,527,357	104.22	2,655,012	14
15. St. John, N. B.	47,514	Not reporting												15
16. Saskatoon, Sask.[66]	43,291	5,402,249	2,893,034	4,796,160	13,091,443	4,068,864	40	10	50	9,022,579	6,267,193	144.77	2,785,459	16
17. Victoria, B. C.	39,082	Not reporting												17
18. Three Rivers, Que.	35,450	Not reporting												18

* = Estimated. N. = None.

[1] *New York City.* General bonds include school, estimated $366,000,000; water, estimated $361,000,000; subways, estimated $722,000,000; dock and ferry, estimated $171,000,000. Net self-supporting debt estimated at $500,000,000.

[2] *Chicago.* General bonds include sanitary district bonds, $91,951,191, 86 per cent of the total debt of the district, based upon the proportion of taxable values within the city. County bonded debt, $34,771,400, and forest preserve district (co-extensive with county), $15,314,000, are not included; 84 per cent of the taxable values are within the city. Utility bonds include street lighting, $7,122,000.

[3] *Philadelphia.* General bonds include utility debt. There is no county debt. Net self-supporting debt estimated at $60,000,000.

[4] *Detroit.* Utility bonds include street railway, $32,564,000, and lighting $21,712,000.

[5] *Los Angeles.* Debt reported excludes flood control, $9,571,105, 61 per cent of the total debt of the district, based upon the proportion of taxable values within the city; utility bonds include light, $35,299,000; and harbor, $21,640,000; school bonds are issued by the county; 86 per cent, the city's pro-rated share based on the valuation, is shown. Flood control and school bonds are as of June 30, 1932.

[6] *Cleveland.* Utility bonds include light and power, $5,741,000.

[7] *Boston.* Utility bonds include rapid transit, $58,932,700; and traffic tunnel, $13,000,000. County debt, which is paid by the city, not included.

[8] *San Francisco.* Utility bonds include street railway, $2,202,000; and power, estimated $16,500,000; $6,000,000 bonds of the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District, of which city comprises 85 per cent of valuation, not included.

[9] *Milwaukee.* General bonds include metropolitan sewerage area bonds, $18,489,434, 79 per cent of the total, based on the proportion of taxable values within the city.

[10] *Minneapolis.* Utility bonds include light, $50,000; market, $21,000; and river terminal, $636,000.

[11] *New Orleans.* General bonds include water, sewerage, and drainage, $8,877,000; utility bonds are Public Belt Railroad. Orleans levee district bonds, $13,932,000, and port of New Orleans bonds, $39,472,000, are not included.

[12] *Cincinnati.* Utility bonds include rapid transit, $6,100,000; airport, $987,000; and Cincinnati Southern Railway, $21,832,000. The annual rental of the railway exceeds the debt charges, being equivalent to debt charges on $10,000,000 general 4 per cent bonds.

[13] *Newark.* Utility bonds include street railway, $8,000,000; and dock, $15,613,000.

[14] *Seattle.* Utility bonds include light, $21,727,000; and street railway, $9,639,000.

[15] *Indianapolis.* General bonds include park district, $3,082,250; and sanitary district, $3,726,000.

[16] *Rochester.* General bonds include school.

[17] *Jersey City.* Utility bonds include dock, $251,000; tax revenue bonds, $17,700,000, not included.

[18] *Louisville.* The city sinking fund owns the capital stock of the Louisville Water Company, estimated to be worth more than $25,000,000.

[19] *Portland.* General bonds include dock, estimated, $7,800,000; and city's share (93 per cent) of port, $3,127,641. Utility bonds include golf, $106,000; city's share of school (97 per cent) is shown; city's share of county, $12,999,794, (90.7 per cent) is not included.

[20] *Columbus.* Utility bonds include light, $2,059,000.

[21] *Denver.* Utility bonds include city's portion of Moffat tunnel, $13,613,600.

[22] *Oakland.* Utility bonds include harbor, $6,984,000; and city's portion (59 per cent) of East Bay Municipal Utility District.

[23] *Omaha.* Utility bonds include gas, $3,380,000.

[24] *Dayton.* City's portion of Miami flood conservancy district bonds not included.

[25] *Richmond.* Utility bonds include light, $300,000; and gas, $3,349,550.

[26] *Flint.* Report as of January 31, 1933.

[27] *Nashville.* Utility bonds include light, $97,000.

[28] *Long Beach.* Utility bonds include gas, $3,790,000.

[29] *Norfolk.* Utility bonds include dock, $5,461,000; general sinking fund includes school; $217,500 unsold bonds in hands of city treasurer not included.

[30] *Jacksonville.* Utility bonds include light, $1,437,500; and street railway, $155,000.

[31] *Kansas City, Kansas.* Utility bonds include light, $2,509,500.

[32] *Chattanooga.* General bonds include school.

[33] *Erie.* Utility bonds include conduits, $32,000.

[34] *Cambridge.* General bonds include school, estimated $1,500,000.

[35] *Miami.* Utility bonds include street railway, $1,025,000.

[36] *Tacoma.* Utility bonds include light, $8,475,000; street railway, $343,000; and garbage, $81,000.

[37] *Wilmington.* Utility bonds include harbor, $2,650,000.

[38] *Knoxville.* Report as of March 21, 1933.

[39] *Lynn, Lowell, Jackson.* General debt includes school.

[40] *Sacramento.* Utility bonds include harbor, $150,000.

[41] *Lansing, Pasadena, Springfield, Kalamazoo, Chicopee, High Point, Sioux Falls, Colorado Springs.* Utility bonds include light, $2,649,000; $378,250; $265,000; $14,000; $33,000; $33,000 $50,000; $1,274,000, respectively.

[42] *Lincoln.* City's proportionate share of school district debt is shown (95.7 per cent) Utility bonds include light, $5,000.

[43] *New Britain.* Utility bonds include conduits, $481,000.

[44] *Charleston, W. Va.* Report as of June 30, 1932.

[45] *Augusta.* City's proportionate share of school district debt is shown (88 per cent).

[46] *Beaumont, Bellingham.* Utility bonds include wharf and dock, $1,790,750; $26,000, respectively.

[47] Holyoke. Utility bonds include gas and electric, $1,056,000; and Holyoke and Westfield R. R., $151,000; general bonds include school.

[48] *Galveston.* General bonds include grade raising, $1,386,000, supported by the state until 1938.

[49] *Hamilton.* Utility bonds include light, $577,500; and gas, $246,390.

[50] *Phoenix.* Utility bonds include street railway, $690,000; report as of March 1, 1933.

[51] *Jamestown.* Utility bonds include light, $133,000; and markets, $21,000.

[52] *Wichita Falls.* Utility bonds include water improvement district, $4,003,000.

[53] *Dubuque.* Utility bonds include docks, $304,000.

[54] *St. Petersburg.* Utility bonds include light, $535,000; street railway, $1,162,000; and gas, $1,038,000.

[55] *Taunton.* Utility bonds include light, $453,000; and street railway, $7,000.

[56] *Hagerstown.* Utility bonds include light, $331,000; and market, $150,000.

[57] *Toronto.* Utility debentures include light, $28,231,000; street railway, $32,697,440; Canadian National Exhibition, $3,259,200; Royal Winter Fair, $1,688,800; housing, $446,000; abbatoir, $304,000; and ferries, $91,000. School debt includes Roman Catholic Schools, $2,415,000.

[58] *Winnipeg.* Utility debentures include light, $25,727,000; steam heating, $1,500,000; and housing, $2,650,000.

[59] *Hamilton, Ottawa.* Utility debentures include light, $3,341,533; $930,230, respectively.

[60] *Calgary.* Utility debentures include light, $3,037,872; and street railway, $2,812,886.

[61] *Edmonton.* Utility debentures include light, $2,818,851; street railway, $2,423,941; and telephone, $2,104,492.

[62] *London.* Utility debentures include light, $1,073,664; street railway, $1,754,732; and housing, $409,996. Report as at January 1, 1932.

[63] *Windsor.* Utility debentures include light, $1,415,144; and housing, $966,854.

[64] *Verdun.* Utility debentures are housing; general include water.

[65] *Regina.* Utility debentures include light, $2,330,198; and street railway, $2,008,018.

[66] *Saskatoon.* Utility debentures include light, $2,181,447; and street railway, $1,376,419.

Is Congress Representative?

An analysis of the 1932 congressional elections[1]

GEORGE H. HALLETT, JR. *Associate Secretary, National Municipal League*

THE last congressional elections presented the usual evidence against the trustworthiness of the plurality method of election, whether applied in single-member districts or to states at large. The national Democratic majority was, to be sure, translated into a Democratic Congress, but beyond that simple piece of luck the results bore little relation to the votes cast. The nationwide verdict was exaggerated and the representation of many states grossly distorted.

CASES OF MINORITY RULE

There were no less than eight states in which a party with less than half the congressional votes elected a majority of the members and in three of these the winning party polled fewer votes than another party which elected fewer members.

In Michigan, for instance, the Democrats polled a few less votes than the Republicans but elected three more members. The explanation, of course, is that the votes happened to be so distributed that the minority (which last time got no representation at all) carried three more districts than the majority.

Michigan

Election of 17 Members from 17 Districts

Party	Votes Cast	Representatives Elected	Representatives in Proportion to Votes
Democratic	769,088	10	8
Republican	773,318	7	9
Others	33,656	0	0

In Kansas the party fortunes were reversed. The Democrats carried the state in popular votes but elected fewer representatives than the Republicans.

Kansas

Election of 7 Members from 7 Districts

Party	Votes Cast	Representatives Elected	Representatives in Proportion to Votes
Democratic	357,154	3	4
Republican	350,332	4	3
Others	11,609	0	0

The other state where this sort of reversal of the popular verdict occurred was California. In that state, however, there is less certainty of injustice because in five districts the candidate of one party captured the nomination of the other and left the opposition no major party candidate to vote for.

[1]Similar studies of previous congressional elections will be found in the *Proportional Representation Review* for July 1931, October 1929, April 1927, April 1925, and earlier issues.

Minnesota furnished an interesting example of minority rule under the "block vote" or plurality election at large. This method was used in five states which had lost representation in the congressional reapportionment and failed for one reason or another to enact a valid plan of redistricting. In Minnesota there were three large parties and the largest, though it received only 38 per cent of the votes, elected five of the nine members.

Minnesota

Election of 9 Members at Large

Party	Number of Candidates	Total vote	Average Vote	Representatives Elected	Representatives in Proportion to Votes
Democratic	9	1,947,388	216,376	1	2
Republican	9	2,775,948	308,349	3	3
Farmer-Labor	9	2,941,373	326,819	5	4
Others[2]	5	118,409	23,682	0	0

EXCLUSION OF MINORITIES

In the other four states the block vote gave all the representation to the largest party, none to everyone else. This is the normal block vote result. A good example is the election in Missouri.

Missouri

Election of 13 Members at Large

Party	Number of Candidates	Total Vote	Average Vote	Representatives Elected	Representatives in Proportion to Votes
Democratic	13	12,962,245	997,096	13	8
Republican	13	7,659,440	589,188	0	5
Socialist	13	149,860	11,528	0	0
Communist	1	627	627	0	0

This exclusion of minorities was by no means confined to the states which elected at large. In state after state where the minority party polled a substantial vote it failed to carry a single one of the districts. Consider the case of Indiana.

Indiana

Election of 12 Members from 12 Districts

Party	Votes Cast	Representatives Elected	Representatives in Proportion to Votes
Democratic	849,821	12	7
Republican	683,517	0	5

EXAGGERATION OF CHANGES

Indiana also illustrates the most striking fact of the election. Changes in votes have brought changes in representation out of all proportion to their size. In 1930 the Democrats polled 53 per cent of the votes in Indiana, in 1932 they polled 55 per cent. Yet in 1930 they elected 9 representatives out of 13, this time 12 out of 12. A change of 2 per cent in votes brought a change of 31 per cent in representation.

In West Virginia the Democrats polled just over 50 per cent of the votes last time and elected 2 out of 6. This time they polled less than 54 per cent and elected all 6.

In Iowa a 14 per cent gain in the Democratic vote brought a 58 per cent gain in representation. In Colorado a gain of 9 per cent brought a gain of 75 per cent in representation.[3]

[2]There were two independents with votes of 82,826 and 784 respectively and three Communists with a total vote of 34,799, average 11,600.

[3]Similar comparisons can be made for all the states by referring to the tables at the end of this article and of the similar article in the *Proportional Representative Review* for July 1931.

(Continued on Page 288)

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

EDITED BY GEORGE H. HALLETT, JR.

Continuing the Proportional Representation Review

Hamilton Votes to Keep P. R.—On May 2 the voters of Hamilton, Ohio, registered their approval of proportional representation for the third time. Adopted as part of a new city manager charter in 1926, P. R. was attacked unsuccessfully by a proposed charter amendment substituting a plurality system of electing council in the fall of 1929 and again by a similar amendment this spring.[1]

The vote this time was 4,215 in favor of the amendment, 6,498 against it. Only one ward out of six, the smallest, gave the amendment a majority. Though the three-to-two victory for P. R. was smaller than the margin in 1926, the friends of good government in Hamilton are well satisfied. The attack on P. R. was well organized and financed and made its appeal to the general spirit of revolt against whatever is that is sure to be strong in times of unemployment and financial distress.

The real motive behind the attack appears to have been the same as in 1926, the desire of dispossessed politicians of the old school to come back and the recognition that P. R. was the real cause of their discomfiture. The same recognition spurred the charter commission which drafted the present charter, the Women's City Club, which initiated the movement for its adoption, and good government forces generally to defend P. R. as the very "heart of the charter." The Hamilton *Journal-News* defined the issue as a battle between "honest and efficient business government" and "the old political spoils system" and defended P. R. as "unquestionably the fairest method yet devised for electing a representative body." Russell Wilson, mayor of Cincinnati, spoke to the combined luncheon clubs on the benefits realized from P. R. in his city. And Norman Thomas, Socialist candidate for president last fall, did much to reassure the working people of the city when he told the Socialist local that "under the present situation in municipalities, P. R. is far and away the best method."

The day after the election Mayor Raymond H. Burke issued the following statement:

> I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the citizens of Hamilton upon keeping P. R. in their city charter. This method of voting is a fundamental part of the charter, and its loss would have robbed the charter of much of its effectiveness for good and efficient government. The campaign on the amendment brought out from its opponents the argument that they found it difficult to understand the counting of the votes under P. R. In order that P. R. may be better understood by our citizens, I hope that the various clubs and groups of all political beliefs will ask for practical demonstrations of the P. R. count. It is like a lot of things in this world—simple enough once truly understood. The more one knows about it the more one will admire and respect it. It is the fairest way that has yet been devised for choosing a legislative body to represent all the citizens of a community.

On the same day the *Journal-News* said editorially:

> Congratulations, people of Hamilton, upon your victory for honest and efficient government.
>
> The vote of Tuesday, when the people were asked to remove from their city char-

[1]See the Proportional Representation Department in the NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW for April.

ter proportional representation, was a decisive victory for Hamilton and the government that has served it so well for the past five years.

Proportional representation is the very essence of Hamilton's city charter, removing the possibility of political control of the city's affairs.

The election of Tuesday again denied to those who would wreck the charter and return to the political spoils system the opportunity which they sought. . . .

Tuesday's charter victory means that Hamilton will continue to go forward; that there will be no political interference in its affairs; that the people will have a strict accounting of their municipal activities; that business methods will continue in the conduct of their municipal plants; and that the people as a whole and not a party, a clique nor a faction, will continue in full command of their government and receive from it the service they not only demand but so efficiently receive.

*

Presidential Amendment Introduced Again.— Congressman Clarence F. Lea of California has re-introduced his proposed constitutional amendment to apply the proportional principle to presidential elections, described in this department in April, as House Joint Resolution 136. It provides that personal electors be abolished, that electoral votes of each state be left unchanged in number but divided among the candidates in exact proportion to their popular votes within the state, and that the candidate for president or vice-president with most electoral votes be declared elected.

Substantially the same amendment, couched in different language but with only very minor differences in substance, has been introduced in the Senate by Senator George W. Norris of Nebraska as Senate Joint Resolution 29. Senator Norris's ability and persistence, which carried the "lame duck" amendment to victory after years of discouragement, will be a most welcome addition in this equally vital effort for constitutional reform.

Some of the reasons for the importance of this amendment were given in this department in April of this year.

*

Pittsburgh Machine Blocks Action in Pennsylvania.—The Pennsylvania legislature adjourned without voting directly on any of the optional proportional representation and manager plan bills which were introduced this year.

Like the Philadelphia and Pittsburgh bills whose fate was described in our last issue, the bills for third-class cities and boroughs were left in committee. In these cases, however, the failure for this session was traceable not to the political forces in the municipalities concerned, a large part of which were favorable, but to Senator Coyne, political "boss" of Pittsburgh. Senator Coyne used his influence with the state Republican organization and the Vare organization in Philadelphia not only to kill the Pittsburgh bill against the expressed wishes of a majority of his own county delegation but to kill everything resembling it for smaller municipalities. Evidently he feared the idea would prove contagious.

The two third-class city bills, one to make the manager plan optional and the other P. R., were referred to the House Committee on Cities headed by a Coyne henchman appropriately named Lynch, who refused to allow either of them to be considered by the committee until requested in writing by a majority of his committee to call a meeting on the manager bill and even then delayed the meeting until a favorable report would have been futile because of impending adjournment. Yet nearly all the third-class city members of the committee were favorable to both these bills and a majority had signed a statement to that effect. Representative DeFrehn of Johnstown, sponsor of the bills, made a statement in the House protesting the "Lynch law" to which they had fallen a victim.

The similar bills for boroughs received fairer treatment, but in spite of the active backing of the State Association of Boroughs were kept in committee on a point of "legislative courtesy." A majority of the House Committee on Boroughs and Townships professed a favorable attitude but were unwilling to override the unfavorable recommendation of a sub-committee of three. Here again Coyne influence was much in evidence.

The Municipal Charter Committee of Pennsylvania, which directed the campaign, is planning to continue its work. Disappointment at the failure to secure legislation at a time of unprecedented public interest in such matters is balanced by the very solid gain in support from political leaders of both parties as well as the public generally. The representatives from Erie, Altoona, Johnstown, Lancaster, Bethlehem, York, McKees-

port, New Castle, Williamsport, Hazleton, Easton, Washington, Butler, Uniontown, Meadville, Greensburg, Sunbury, and Connellsville, and some of the representatives of both parties from Philadelphia and Pittsburgh either voted for the discharge of the committee from further consideration of the Pittsburgh P. R.-manager bill or made definite statements that they would support such legislation for their own municipalities if it came to a vote. The Democratic leaders and members gave their support almost to a man, though the sponsors of six of the seven bills were Republicans.

IS CONGRESS REPRESENTATIVE?

(Continued from Page 285)

It was of such stuff that the Democratic landslide was made. In 1930 and for several years previous the Democratic party was under-represented. Now suddenly it is over-represented. It is well known, of course, that violent swings of the pendulum have characterized the majority system of election wherever it has been used.

A HAPHAZARD SYSTEM

The reason for this and for all the other anomalies mentioned in this article is that votes are in effect disregarded unless they are cast for the majority candidates in their particular districts. One and a half million Republican votes in Pennsylvania elect 23 congressmen, but the same

ELECTION OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES[4]
NOVEMBER 8, 1932

State	Votes Cast			Members Elected			Members by P. R.[5]		
	Democratic	Republican	Others	D	R	O	D	R	O
Alabama	215,188	22,669	1,476	9	0	0	9	0	0
Arizona	75,469	29,710	1,405	1	0	0	1	0	0
Arkansas	211,924	4,921		7	0	0	7	0	0
California	849,270[6]	941,668[7]	84,091	11	9	0	9	11	0
Colorado	234,843	191,903	2,733	4	0	0	2	2	0
Connecticut[8]	282,021	290,277[9]	17,853	2	4	0	3	3	0
Delaware	51,698	48,841	11,557	1	0	0	1	0	0
Florida[8]	197,903	19,010	3	5	0	0	5	0	0
Georgia	254,225	12,872	49	10	0	0	10	0	0
Idaho	100,922	78,818	3,815	2	0	0	1	1	0
Illinois[8]	1,728,587	1,369,666	57,163	19	8	0	15	12	0
Indiana	849,821	683,517		12	0	0	7	5	0
Iowa	495,782	439,783		6	3	0	5	4	0
Kansas	357,154	350,332	11,609	3	4	0	4	3	0
Kentucky[10]	573,837	390,694	3,497	9	0	0	5	4	0
Louisiana	244,681			8	0	0	8	0	0
Maine	118,366	116,719	213	2	1	0	2	1	0
Maryland	299,954	150,552	3,330	6	0	0	4	2	0
Massachusetts	716,951	769,327	14,416	5	10	0	7	8	0
Michigan	769,088	773,318	33,656	10	7	0	8	9	0
Minnesota[10]	216,376	308,439	350,501[11]	1	3	5[12]	2	3	4[12]
Mississippi	129,954	4,734[13]	90	7	0	0	7	0	0
Missouri[10]	997,096	580,188	12,155[14]	13	0	0	8	5	0
Montana	115,262	87,223	6,386	2	0	0	1	1	0
Nebraska	296,256	208,956	40,991	5	0	0	3	2	0
Nevada	24,979	16,133		1	0	0	1	0	0
New Hampshire	94,765	97,795	516	1	1	0	1	1	0
New Jersey	724,572	751,094	26,068	4	10	0	7	7	0
New Mexico	94,764	52,905	1,899	1	0	0	1	0	0
New York[8]	2,387,621	1,785,365	251,235[15]	29	16	0	25	18	2[16]
North Carolina	492,050	214,022		11	0	0	8	3	0
North Dakota[10]	72,177	139,839	684	0	2	0	1	1	0
Ohio[8]	1,293,822	1,168,942	16,498	18	6	0	13	11	0
Oklahoma[8]	462,132	186,599	5,049	9	0	0	7	2	0
Oregon	164,682	148,262	36,790	2	1	0	2	1	0
Pennsylvania	1,102,224[17]	1,529,944[17]	139,084[18]	11	23	0	14	19	1[19]
Rhode Island	143,400	115,933	528	2	0	0	1	1	0
South Carolina	104,646	1,987		6	0	0	6	0	0
South Dakota	146,886	121,128	5,347	2	0	0	1	1	0
Tennessee	217,904	88,686	33,859[20]	7	2	0	6	2	1[20]
Texas[8]	777,733	37,952	8	21	0	0	20	1	0
Utah	110,174	91,746	3,673	2	0	0	1	1	0
Vermont	47,591	86,194	16	0	1	0	0	1	0
Virginia[10]	203,776	72,108	13,038	9	0	0	7	2	0
Washington	327,702	186,580	39,255	6	0	0	4	2	0
West Virginia	392,924	341,170	1,694	6	0	0	3	3	0
Wisconsin	500,710	469,764	73,603[21]	5	5	0	5	5	0
Wyoming	43,056	44,816	2,319	0	1	0	0	1	0
	20,312,918	15,632,101	1,308,152	313	117	5	268[22]	159[22]	8[22]

See opposite page for notes.

number in Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Indiana elect none at all. Three quarters of a million Democratic votes in New Jersey elect four congressmen; half a million in North Carolina elect eleven.

Because votes have such different values depending on where they are cast, the representation of the American people in their supreme legislative body becomes a veritable gamble. We cannot hope to have true representative government until we give all votes approximately equal value regardless of where they are polled. And this can only be accomplished through proportional representation.

The table above gives the results for all the states and proportional representation results with the same votes for comparison. It cannot of course give any indication of the changes in the votes themselves that would occur if voters were everywhere free to cast their ballots for minority candidates without danger of wasting them.

---

[4]Official figures as published by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

[5]The figures in this column have been calculated as if each state were a single congressional district electing its allotted quota of members by proportional representation with the single transferable vote (Hare system), assuming that each voter voted for all the candidates of the party for which he actually voted and for no other. If P. R. were actually used the largest states would probably be divided into two or more multi-member districts, but that would not interfere seriously with the proportionality of the result.

[6]This is the total vote for the Democratic nominees who call themselves Democrats. One of them, with a vote of 73,400, received the Republican as well as the Democratic nomination.

[7]This is the total vote for the Republican nominees who call themselves Republicans. Four of them, with a total vote of 253,448, received the Democratic as well as the Republican nomination.

[8]The following states elected some of their members from the state at large: Connecticut 1, Florida 1, Illinois 2, New York 2, Ohio 2, Oklahoma 1, and Texas 3. The total votes given for these states are the totals of the votes cast for district representatives.

[9]This includes the votes cast for Republicans, 285,208, and for Independent Republicans, 5,069. Independent Republicans opposed the regular Republican candidates in all districts.

[10]Because of a decrease in representation and failure to enact a valid redistricting plan, the following states elected all of their members at large: Kentucky, Minnesota, Missouri, North Dakota, and Virginia. The votes given for these states are in every case the average vote for candidates of the party.

[11]This figure is the sum of 326,819, the average vote of nine Farmer-Labor candidates, and 23,689, the average vote of five others.

[12]Farmer-Labor.

[13]Lilly White Republicans, 2,881; Black and Tan Republicans, 1,853. Both groups nominated separate candidates in all districts.

[14]This figure is the sum of 11,528, the average vote of 13 Socialist candidates, and 627, the vote of a single Communist.

[15]Of these votes 178,250 were cast for candidates of the Socialist party.

[16]Socialist.

[17]In Pennsylvania four Republican candidates, with a total vote of 302,917, received the Democratic nomination also, and one Democratic candidate, with a total vote of 69,684, received the Republican nomination. A number of the major party candidates also received the endorsement of one or more smaller parties. In every case the total vote of the candidate has been credited to the party to which he belongs.

[18]Of these votes 84,712 were cast for candidates of the Socialist party. Socialist votes cast for major party candidates who captured the Socialist nomination are not included.

[19]Socialist.

[20]In Tennessee several candidates ran without party endorsement. One of these, with a vote of 27,888, would be entitled to a seat on a proportional distribution.

[21]Of these votes 63,946 were cast for candidates of the Socialist party.

[22]A proportional assignment on the basis of the totals for the whole country instead of state by state would be: Democratic 237, Republican 183, other parties (if they were united) 15. The discrepancy is due chiefly to two factors: (1) the vote in the South is very small in proportion to population, so that the apportionment of members to states on the basis of population gives southern votes a greater value than northern votes; (2) the number of members allotted to a number of the smaller states is too small to allow a satisfactory proportional assignment on a state basis.

RECENT BOOKS REVIEWED

EDITED BY EDNA TRULL

Local Government in the United States. By Murray Seasongood. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1933. 145 pp. $1.50.

It is a rare pleasure to welcome a book on municipal government by an accomplished practitioner. Seldom, if ever, does a former mayor of a city write a book for the use and information of his fellow citizens and the inspiration of youth. In America this literary function is generally left to professors, who, despite their many merits, have seldom been through the fire of living experience in politics and administration. Murray Seasongood has happily turned the tables. From his law practice he stepped into politics of the rough and tumble kind and served as first mayor and chairman of the city planning commission under the reform regime adopted by Cincinnati in 1925. Strengthened in spirit, rather than embittered, by the buffets of fortune, he accepted the important post of president of the National Municipal League and took leadership in translating his experience into action on a larger stage.

Recognizing that Mr. Seasongood had something important to say and could say it effectively, Harvard University invited him to give the Godkin Lectures on citizenship. This volume is the result. Its value may be measured in various terms. It supplies first-hand knowledge of the ways in which a parasitic gang of politicians can and does run a city. This story Mr. Seasongood tells with a forthright directness that engages the interest of the reader. In the second place, the volume describes briefly but pointedly the operations by which the parasitic gang in Cincinnati was thrown out of power and an honest and efficient administration installed. In the third place, Mr. Seasongood summarizes the methods by which an effective system of accounting and control may be established to defeat the efforts of a parasitic gang to regain dominion in the municipality. But he is not content with systems of administration. He realizes that these are human instruments, not ends in themselves, and that vigorous and courageous personalities are necessary to carry systems into execution.

If space did permit, it would be interesting to summarize the whole volume as a kind of guide to efficient administration. But we must be content with a single illustration. Mr. Seasongood considers among other things the rôle of the press in municipal corruption and reform, and he is inclined to the critical in a realistic way. "In essence," he says, "the press should fulfill a great public function, serving impartially the noble cause of enlightenment. But it is a purely private enterprise purporting to serve a public purpose. The owner of a newspaper may not be wise or even honest; he may have a controlling interest in local utilities, and can easily trade the influence of his columns for oppressive franchises or unwarranted tax exemptions or reduction to them or him or his paper. As a City Hall reporter once expressed it, 'Our paper preaches the highest morality and practices the lowest. If the old man gets a cinder in his eye, I am expected to write an editorial on smoke abatement.'"

It would be difficult to imagine a better little book to put into the hands of all young citizens, but if it were introduced in the schools, local patriotic societies would assail it as seditious and the local press would rage against "preaching Bolshevism." But until

Columbia University
Harvard College
The Law School Library

citizens know how a parasitic gang may rise, flourish, and fatten, how can they be expected to overcome the enemy?

CHARLES A. BEARD.

*

Transition Zoning. By Arthur C. Comey, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1933. 150 pp. $2.50.

Building zoning began in this country under two general controlling provisions: (1) that the regulations within a district should be uniform, and (2) that permits in exceptional situations should be subject to variance by a Board of Appeals, followed by court review where desired. The needs of a single district were assumed to be substantially the same. If they were not the same, then two or three or more districts would be established. The favor of courts for zoning was undoubtedly assisted by this requirement of uniformity. On the other hand, many of the principal zoners regretted to have exceptional permits thrown into the hands of a discretionary board subject to court review. Some boards were good and some not so good. Then, too, it seemed desirable to lessen the field of discretion whereever possible by placing precise provisions in ordinances. As boundary lines between districts produced many instances of practical difficulty and unnecessary hardship which in regular course would go to a discretionary board, efforts to narrow the functioning of these boards naturally centered on boundary lines. Chicago was an early city whose zoning ordinance provided different regulations in the edge of a district from those controlling the rest of the district. For instance, a residence district would cause all or part of its regulations to be observed for a certain number of feet in the adjoining business district.

Many municipalities inserted these protective precautions at boundaries because they considered that restricted districts could be protected in this way better than any other. Some, of whom I am one, have pointed out that courts might consider that this method transgressed the requirement of uniformity of regulation within a single district. It should be conceded that courts may say that uniformity simply means uniformity of application of rules, or that the edges of districts near boundary lines constitute separate districts from the rest of the district. In other words, that the zoning map shows the main districts, and the provisions of the ordinance show that there are sub-districts along the boundary lines.

Where both the residence and business districts are vacant land, I should imagine that a court might find less reason for upholding the hang-over of the residence regulations into the business district. On suit brought by the borderline owner within the business district, the court might say that where there were no buildings on either side of the line it is unreasonable to compel the landowner to make the sacrifice. Then, too, the court might say that the local legislative body might change the line and thus penalize the builder. On the other hand, it may well be said that these refinements of zoning will have the best effect if they begin to operate on undeveloped land. Some zoners like myself, in trying to build up court opinions in favor of zoning, have tended to keep regulations rather simple. Others, of whom Mr. Comey is one, hope to make zoning more precisely effective by these refinements. Each municipality can take its choice. Any one who is interested in the arguments favoring transition zoning or to know what the courts have already said should read this book.

So far as I know, Mr. Comey coined the term Transition Zoning. It has sometimes been called boundary line zoning. Mr. Comey's word has the merit of being more definite, and perhaps as time goes on it will be equally well understood. The book is a real and valuable contribution to the science of modern zoning in this country. The illustrations are remarkable throughout. It is abreast of the other books put out by the Harvard School of City Planning and that is saying a good deal. It has been a laborious piece of work and great credit must be given to Mr. Comey for preparing it.

EDWARD M. BASSETT.

*

Home Ownership, Income and Types of Dwellings. By President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership. Washington, 1932. 230 pages. $1.15.

The *Leitmotiv* of this volume, as of practically all the other volumes of the series, is the importance of home ownership. Thus, we find the statement: "It is doubtful whether democracy is possible where tenants overwhelmingly outnumber home owners. For democracy is not a privilege; it is a responsibility, and human nature rarely volunteers to shoulder

responsibility, but has to be driven by the whip of necessity." And again: "Responsible citizenship is largely dependent upon individuals having a stake in the community, which is the major source of civic pride and judicious participation in the affairs of local government. Through the relation of his home to its neighborhood and to the city government, the home owner acquires a keener civic interest and a greater sense of civic responsibility." Besides, home ownership is held to aid in the development of thrift, self-respect, character, and many of the other virtues which are generally deemed desirable.

The problem then is to analyze the methods of helping people own their own homes, but, since a great many American families unfortunately do not own their own homes, some attention is devoted to the question of leasing. In the report of the committees on *Home Ownership and Leasing,* and *The Relationship of Income and the Home,* and on *Types of Dwellings,* there is much useful material and many interesting suggestions which should aid people interested in housing. This is particularly true of the discussion on *Problems of Renting, Home Ownership and the Business Cycle,* and on *Types of Dwellings.* Unfortunately, this volume overlaps in many places with the material contained in the reports of other committees.

EMANUEL STEIN.

*

General Index of the Final Reports of the President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership. Washington, 1933. 114 pp. $1.15.

The importance of a good index in enhancing the value of a thorough piece of work is so well recognized as to need no comment. It may well be pointed out, however, that this particular volume is the index for the final reports of thirty-one committees, published in eleven volumes, combining and amplifying the indexes in the separate volumes. It also provides the key to the use of varying terminology by the different groups of committee members, an extremely valuable function when so many different backgrounds and points of view have been called into the discussion. An examination of the double column pages is a reminder of the comprehensive nature of the studies and there is temptation to list some of the more important subjects dealt with, but the list, even of important phases, would be long, so that merely titles must serve to recall the series—*Planning for Residential Districts; Home Finance and Taxation; Slums, Large Scale Housing and Decentralization; Home Ownership, Income and Types of Dwellings; House Design, Construction and Equipment; Negro Housing; Farm and Village Housing; Housing and the Community, Home Repair and Remodeling; Household Management and Kitchens; Homemaking, Home Furnishing and Information Services; Housing Objectives and Programs.* The committee personnel, it will be remembered, included outstanding experts in the respective fields.

The *General Index* will prove an interesting tool to all those interested in any subject which touches upon home building and home ownership.

The organization known as the Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership, which is responsible for the preparation and publication of the reports, has, it may be noted, moved its headquarters from Washington to 42 Broadway, New York City.

*

Radio Equipped Patrol Cars for the Department of Sheriff of the County, Los Angeles, Calif. By C. R. Jones and H. E. Earl, Los Angeles, Bureau of Efficiency of the County of Los Angeles, 1933. 57 pp. mimeo.

The rapid spread of the use of the radio in police departments and the interest of many other cities in its installation warrant a genuine welcome for this survey. After observation of radio-equipped patrol cars in cities, and a consideration of factors differentiating their use in cities and in the wider territory covered by a sheriff, the Bureau concluded that the installation of radio in patrol cars would provide the sheriffs' department with a flexible, mobile weapon for the protection of life and property, and that approximately only four thousand dollars' expenditure would be needed. Fortunately the city of Los Angeles uses this system and the use of its transmitter for a one or two-year trial period might be worked out. The data on which the conclusions were reached were worked out from over one hundred calls actually answered by sheriffs' cars in which Bureau staff members were observing. The statistics and explanations of the contributing factors will be of great value to cities

or other governmental units contemplating the use of radio patrol.

*

The New American Government and Its Work, Third Edition. By James T. Young. New York, Macmillan, 1933. 1024 pp. $3.50.

From the earlier editions of this book, 1915 and 1923, students of government have become familiar with Professor Young's valuable emphasis upon administration of our national affairs. It is useful to have his study brought down to the close of the Hoover regime.

Not only has the material been brought down to date and numerous recent references included, but several new features have been incorporated into this edition. They include: discussions of policy as well as description of fact in all the major chapters, contemporary criticism, expressions of opinion and explanations given by those engaged in administration as well as by more detached persons, the effects of the depression both upon governmental systems and through the imposition of new tasks, new legislation, executive actions and court decisions, and also completely new chapters.

Professor Young believes that the continued increase in governmental duties and powers, the emphasized conflict of class interests, and the evident permanence of government through organized minorities, are changes which tend to overwhelm the legislative power. In the face of what he calls the "congressional collapse," he suggests that "we must be about the further remodelling of our government structure to assure it of greater efficiency and speed."

In connection with the final chapter on "Some Unsolved Problems," it is suggested that the student debate the addition to the Constitution of this amendment:

"When in time of public danger or emergency the national welfare may require, Congress may transfer its full legislative power to the President, who shall exercise it by decrees and ordinances, countersigned by a majority of the cabinet secretaries or heads of departments. Such decrees and ordinances shall be valid and binding as law until the close of the next session of Congress, unless repealed by that body." Perhaps a few months from now, even the operation of such an amendment would seem as cumbersome as the old system! We look forward to future editions of books emphasizing administrative practice.

*

Analysis of the Debt of the City of Detroit as at February 28, 1933. By the Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research, Inc. Detroit, Bureau of Governmental Research, Inc., 1933. 23 pp. $1.

With Detroit finances steadily receiving space in newspaper columns, the primary reason for the difficulties is of particular interest. The Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research has analyzed the bonded debt of the city and presents a number of tables and charts showing clearly just what are the requirements under existing obligations and what they will be over the life of the bonds. Unfunded debt is also explained.

*

Construction and Operation of Municipal Powers. By Charles W. Tooke. Philadelphia, *Temple Law Quarterly,* 1933. 23 pp.

Professor Tooke in the April issue of the *Temple Law Quarterly,* presents his opinions on some of the problems of constitutional and statutory construction arising in connection with the extent of the powers delegated to municipal corporations under our system of government. He refutes the opinion often expressed by laymen that the law is contradictory and inconsistent in the construction of municipal powers and claims that the decisions are, on the whole, based upon fundamental principles of constitutional law and established rules of statutory interpretation. He presents the methods possible to determine the extent of municipal powers, and holds that the present system with the courts delimiting the municipal powers, places the exercise on the soundest possible basis.

GOVERNMENTAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION NOTES

EDITED BY ROBERT M. PAIGE — *Secretary-Treasurer, G. R. A.*

The Tennessee Taxpayers Association is engaged in making a series of surveys of county governments. A report of Haywood County, their first survey, has recently been published. It is estimated that under existing law maximum savings of $25,000 a year may be secured out of a total county budget of approximately $300,000, by the adoption of the recommendations of the survey staff. The Taxpayers Association is now conducting a survey of Sumner County and will shortly begin one of Campbell County.

*

The New York State Conference of Mayors is coöperating with the state in making studies of pension funds in New York State cities. The Conference's Bureau of Training and Research, Albert Hall, director, at the invitation of city officials, collects the basic data necessary for a complete analysis of each pension system. George Buck, a consulting actuary of New York City, then analyzes these figures and submits a report.

Police and fire pension funds are maintained by many New York cities, although the pension funds of other municipal employees, including teachers, are held by the state. The latter arrangement has many advantages and independent pension funds are gradually being eliminated.

*

The Rochester Bureau of Municipal Research has recently issued a report, "Refuse Collection and Disposal in Cincinnati." Hazen Pratt of the Bureau's staff visited Cincinnati and compiled an analysis of methods and costs which made possible a comparison with costs in Rochester. Cincinnati was selected because of its size and because it has installed the system of public works records recommended by the Committee on Uniform Street and Sanitation Records (923 East 60th Street, Chicago). Subsequent reports will deal with other phases of the refuse problem and definite recommendations will be presented to the Rochester Commissioner of Public Works, who requested the Bureau to undertake this study.

*

Local Government Reorganization.— The Exploratory Research Conference on the Reorganization of Areas and Functions of Local Government met in New York, April 28 and 29, at the Institute of Public Administration. The problem of allocating responsibility for maintenance and construction of rural highways was the particular phase of the reorganization problem under discussion. The Institute of Public Administration is preparing to make an intensive study to determine how local government can be reorganized most satisfactorily from an administrative point of view.

The first report of the Michigan Commission of Inquiry into County, Township, and School District Government, entitled "Organization and Cost of County and Township Government," by Lent D. Upson and Professors Thomas Reed and Arthur Bromage of the University of Michigan, has appeared. This report contains, in addition to recommendations for a sweeping reorganization of local government, excellent chapters on county and township government in representative states. The authors recommend the abolition of the township; a smaller county board, elected at large; a county executive, either appointed by the board or elected at large; and a departmentalized county government.

A proposal for the reorganization of the government of Jackson County, Missouri,

drafted by the local government committee of the Kansas City, Missouri, Chamber of Commerce, provides that the legislative and administrative body of the county, the county court, shall consist of three judges elected for four-year overlapping terms. This court of three judges would select one of its own number to be chief administrative officer of the county. This presiding judge would appoint, with the consent of the court, the heads of the three main departments, revenue, public works, and welfare, into which county functions would be grouped. The elective offices of assessor, collector, treasurer, recorder of deeds, and highway engineer would be abolished. A comptroller appointed by the court would be responsible for the accounting system of the county and the execution of the budget, and the court would be given the power to fix the number and salaries of county employees.

*

New Orleans Bureau of Governmental Research.— On May 10 a group of New Orleans citizens announced the establishment of this bureau. The board of directors consists of twenty-three public-spirited citizens, representative of the business interests of the community. The officers are: president, Charles A. Favrot, prominent architect; vice president, Edgar B. Stern, cotton broker, banker, and civic leader; secretary, Arthur Waters; treasurer, Joseph M. Jones. Harold A. Stone is the executive secretary and director of research.

*

The Toronto Bureau of Municipal Research has just presented its nineteenth annual report. Twelve White Papers and Open Letters dealing with the budget, the city's credit, and other matters were published during the year. The demand for speakers was greater than ever before, and the Bureau was able through the newspapers and the radio, to present the results of its surveys and recommendations to an exceptionally large number of people. Horace L. Brittain is the managing director of the Bureau and also of the Citizens' Research Institute of Canada, an affiliated organization.

*

The Civic Research Institute of Kansas City, Missouri, has prepared a report on "Trends in City Finance in Kansas City." It includes statistical data relative to assessed valuations, tax rates, general and special fund income and expenditures, tax delinquencies, bonded indebtedness, etc. These statistics are presented with descriptive paragraphs but without interpretation. The Institute has recently issued a similar report on school finance, and a report dealing with county finance is in preparation.

*

Salary Survey in California.— The California State Employees Association and the State Division of Personnel and Organization have just completed a study of the comparative salaries of state, municipal, and commercial employees engaged in similar work. This study indicates that state salaries in general are slightly below commercial salaries. For example, there are 771 positions in the state service designated as "clerical" and the average monthly salary of these employees is $120.08. Salaries for 2229 comparable positions in commercial firms average $133.

Thirteen categories of employment are compared in this way. In a lengthy appendix the supporting data are presented in full.

*

A Digest of Governmental Surveys.— Professor John A. Fairlie, of the University of Illinois, in the April *American Political Science Review* digests the governmental surveys which have been made in the last few years by the Brookings Institution, Institute of Public Administration, and Griffenhagen, by special commissions, and by other research agencies in the states of New Jersey, New York, New Hampshire, Maine, Arkansas, Georgia, North Carolina, Virginia, Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee, Illinois, Minnesota, Ohio, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Texas. Paul Studenski, of New York University, reviews the Merriam and the Griffenhagen reports on Chicago; and Joseph McGoldrick, of Columbia University, summarizes the proposals for the reorganization of the city of New York.

*

The Seattle Municipal League, an organization of citizens interested in good government, and active since 1910, has selected a new secretary, Elvin P. Carney, an attorney who has been a vice president of the League. The League's new offices will be in the Dexter-Horton Building, Seattle, Washington.

NOTES AND EVENTS

Sacramento County Adopts Manager Charter.—The voters of Sacramento County, California, by a vote of 17,069 to 13,937 on April 27, 1933, approved a county charter that installed a county executive in the central rôle. Thus Sacramento becomes the second California county to adopt the county manager idea, San Mateo having adopted a county manager charter November 8, 1932.[1] This is the second attempt to establish a county manager form of government in Sacramento, the first being in 1922. Sacramento County has a population of 141,999, according to the 1930 census, 93,750 living within the one large city, Sacramento, the capital city of California. The manager form of government as it operates in the city of Sacramento provided an example by which favorable attention was attracted to the county charter.

The county executive as contemplated by the charter is to have power to appoint, on approval of the board of supervisors, such officers as coroner, county engineer, license collector, public administrator, county clerk, recorder, surveyor, tax collector, superintendent of schools, treasurer, and constable. Clerks and assistants may be appointed, without civil service provisions, by heads of departments on the approval of the executive.

The charter sets up a short ballot providing for election of supervisors, district attorney, sheriff, assessor, auditor. Any elected official who fails to coöperate with the executive is to be considered guilty of misconduct in office.

The supervisors continue to appoint members of the boards of education, law, library trustees, county health and welfare, and the county librarian and agricultural commissioner. The executive himself is appointed by the board of supervisors and may be removed only by a four-fifths vote of the board. His salary is to be from $5,000 to $7,000. He may not be removed within two years after appointment except for incompetency, malfeasance, misfeasance or neglect of duties; or one year in the case of managers succeeding the first incumbent. The executive is to advise the board of supervisors, examine all claims against the county, consult with the supervisors regarding letting of contracts, and act as purchasing agent. He is not given complete power in the preparation of the budget, but is required to compile the departmental estimates and may advise the board of supervisors to reduce estimates.

Existing road districts are consolidated to form one district for the county, and road work is to be directed by the county engineer, appointed by the executive. No claims for road work may be passed or paid unless approved by the engineer and executive.

If the charter is approved by the legislature during its session in July the old board of supervisors will have the opportunity to fill the office of county executive.

WINSTON W. CROUCH.
University of California

*

Sins of Omission in New York's Budget Bill.—When the city that led the way toward budget-mindedness by our nation's cities, states, philanthropies, and federal government "goes native," it is an event—and a warning. New York City has just done this in passing an executive budget bill that omits so much and does so much in the native way that governmental researchers and budget statesmen elsewhere will marvel at the anachronism.

While it was an imminent possibility that Aldermanic President Joseph V. McKee would run for mayor, perhaps in the Democratic

[1] See article in NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW, Dec., 1932, E. H. Cottrell, "San Mateo County Adopts Manager Plan."

primaries, Mayor O'Brien grasped at straws or even imaginary straws to forestall McKee credit. When therefore McKee introduced two budget bills, O'Brien desperately needed his own budget bills. The Citizens' Budget Commission seized the opportunity to "coöperate" and drafted budget bills. The papers first announced that the Citizens' Budget Commission "backed the mayor's budget bills." Soon pride of authorship proved too strong and the C B C confessed its part and circularized taxpayers with the claim that the bills, "if enacted into law, will constitute the most far-reaching change in our city government that has been made since the creation of the greater city."

The Citizens Union, T. D. Zukerman, the United Realty Owners Association, *inter alia*, pointed out dangers and defects but the bills were immediately passed.

The executive budget bill will need amendment—after it has cost the backing taxpayers a few hundred millions and helped the city further toward bankruptcy—for the following reasons:

1. It gives seven members of the board of estimate but five days including Sunday to digest the mayor's budget and vote a tentative budget.

2. It relieves department heads of responsibility for their budgets, ignoring Al Smith's repeated warnings that such heads should be required to sign and sponsor their requests.

3. It repeats the federal budget plan's error of building up in departments a new budget bureaucracy living in a glass house of apology for what is.

4. It fails to require all authorizations to be in the budget—thus perpetuating an evil that has omitted $456,000,000 authorized from the last eight budgets.

5. It fails to require semi-independent bodies like schools to show all costs. In eight years $560,000,000 authorized and spent for schools has never appeared in the board of education budget summaries, and $261,000,000 never appeared anywhere, even in school totals.

6. It does not permit continuous balancing of budgets by the quarterly or even monthly allotments that the depression has proved indispensable to control.

7. It does not require the budget director to report his use of power to fill vacancies, promote, and increase pay, which power has been a vast racket for years.

8. It requires no recommendations for economy or else confession that the budget director hasn't any, except when special field surveys are made.

9. No hearing by the board of aldermen is required.

10. Instead of requiring an estimate of final assessments it calls for the tentative assessments.

11. By claiming that new budget powers are concentrated in the mayor, not only is history falsified but the public is deprived of a lesson it should never forget; namely, that all our mayors, including Mayor McKee last year, have had full power to submit all desirable matters that the new bill permits except the comptroller's estimates of revenue.

—W. H. Allen
Institute for Public Service, N. Y. C.

*

Reorganization in Indiana Proceeds.—The "Executive-Administrative" act of Indiana signed February 3, 1933, authorized the governor to consolidate all the administrative agencies of the state into eight specified departments.[1] Acting under this authority the governor, by executive order, bearing date of April 15, assigned the several existing organization units of the executive branch to the departments created by the statute.

To the executive department are transferred the following major groups:—those relating to public safety, including state police, criminal identification, and fire marshal; the adjutant general and related agencies; the board of charities and some twenty benevolent, charitable, and correctional institutions, and the department of inspection and examination of public offices which carries with it the budget bureau.

To the department of audit and control are transferred, in addition to the regular duties of the auditor, the banking and insurance departments, and gasoline and oil licensing and inspecting departments.

The treasury department is to assume, besides the ordinary duties of the department, the work of the automobile license bureau, the tax commission, and the administration of the inheritance, sales, and chain-store taxes.

To the department of law is given the duties of the attorney-general, together with those of the legislative bureau.

---

[1] National Municipal Review, March, 1933, P. 137.

The department of public works is made to include the functions of the conservation commission, the highway commission, the excise director (administrator of the beer law), printing, purchasing, and public buildings.

To the department of commerce and industry are transferred the duties of the board of health, industrial board (in charge of factory inspection and workmen's compensation), the public service commission, mines and mining, and the several agencies dealing with agricultural matters.

The department of education is to assume the powers and duties of the superintendent of public instruction, the board of education, the trustees of the two state universities and the normal schools, as well as the state library and historical department.

The department of state, in addition to the duties usually attaching to the office, is to perform the work of issuing certificates of incorporation, licenses to foreign corporations, and the administration of the "blue sky" law, as well as the duty of examining persons engaging in the licensed trades and professions.

The actual transfers consequent upon the issuance of this order are still in progress and many details remain to be worked out. It is presumed that many of the more important of the existing agencies will remain substantially intact as bureaus in the newly created departments. It is understood that the grouping of functions involved in the order here under consideration is to some degree tentative and that subsequent orders may effect changes in the arrangements as above outlined.

—Frank G. Bates

Indiana University

*

Municipal Discussions at Summer Institute.—The Wellesley Summer Institute for Social Progress, which is to be held July 1-15 on the campus of Wellesley College, Wellesley, Massachusetts, will include municipal problems among those to be discussed under direction of leading economists by a representative group of men and women. Particulars as to membership in the Institute may be had from Dr. Alfred Sheffield, 130 Madison Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

*

Additional Relief Funds Available for Your City.—With the signing of the new relief bill by President Roosevelt, a sum of $500,000,000 is made available to the cities for relief purposes. If your city needs additional assistance, therefore, you should make application at once to the duly constituted state relief authorities.

The act authorizes the distribution of $250,000,000 of the fund on the basis of relief expenditures within the states during the preceding quarter. The balance is to be allotted on the basis of need. All funds advanced are made as a direct grant and not as a loan. Section E of the old R. F. C. Act, under which cities were required to put up collateral, is completely eliminated. The United States Conference of Mayors estimates that through the elimination of this section the cities of the United States have been saved about $50,000,000. In some states where the governors forced cities to issue relief bonds under Section E, this elimination will be most helpful.

The final act carries out in full the resolution on unemployment relief adopted at the Washington Conference on February 17.

Paul V. Betters.

American Municipal Association

*

Simplification and Economy in Missouri.—The 1933 session of the Missouri legislature passed a number of bills designed to reduce expenditures and to simplify governmental organization. Numerous boards were abolished and their duties transferred to departments headed by an official appointed by and removable by the governor. Divisions abolished include the boards of agriculture, health, and charities. A state purchasing department was created and an executive budget system established, with the chairman of the tax commission as budget director.

Local government is affected by the laws providing for a county budget system.

Robert M. Paige.

Governmental Research Association

*

Conflicting State and Federal Taxation.—Definite progress toward the reduction of tax competition between the federal government and the states was made April 22 at a joint meeting of official representatives of the states and members of the committee of the national Congress having charge of tax legislation.

At this meeting State Senator Seabury C. Mastick of New York, Chairman of the Interstate Commission on Conflicting Taxation, explained that the commission had approved

certain recommendations, the first of which is that gasoline taxes be left to the states. In compensation for relinquishing this field, another recommendation suggests that the states in turn agree to give up tobacco taxes. A third recommendation favors reserving electrical energy taxes for the states, since the conditions of the production and distribution of electricity vary so widely.

Senator Pat Harrison of Mississippi, chairman of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue of the national Congress, stated that he substantially approved these recommendations. He added that he favors leaving the general sales tax field to the states. In order to impress the states with the federal government's desire to coöperate he expressed his willingness to have the finance committee go on record as disapproving the continuance of the federal gasoline tax after June 30, 1934. It was the opinion of both the federal and state groups that this will encourage states to make concessions in respect to giving up tobacco taxes.

On May 3 Senator Harrison appointed a subcommittee of the Senate Finance Committee "for the purpose of studying federal and state taxation and the duplication existing therein, and to coöperate and contact with the states working out a plan by which our taxing system as a whole may be improved." A similar subcommittee already has been created by the House Ways and Means Committee. It is headed by Representative Fred M. Vinson of Kentucky. Representative Robert L. Doughton of North Carolina, Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the national House of Representatives, also has expressed his approval of the work of the Interstate Commission and his desire to coöperate.

ROBERT M. PAIGE.

*

Sales Taxes — Adopted, Invalidated. — The 3 per cent sales tax recently adopted in Illinois was declared unconstitutional by the State Supreme Court on May 10, on the grounds that by attempting to exclude from its operation farmers selling their own products, it was not uniform in application. About $8,000,000 collected since April 1 is supposed to be returned to purchasers.

In Arizona likewise the sales tax law was declared unconstitutional as not having been properly passed. A special session of the legislature is expected to be called to remedy the situation.

North Carolina adopted a 3 per cent sales tax despite great opposition. It is expected to yield $8,000,000 per annum and help to overcome the state's deficit. The state has assumed support of the public school system. The state university, while much restricted in funds, has been granted more than was previously proposed.

*

Oregon Electorate to Decide Fate of Sales Tax Legislation.—In Oregon, the voters themselves will decide whether they want to pay a sales tax. The legislature approved a general sales tax of 2 per cent on all retail sales and one-half of 1 per cent on all wholesale sales. Personal services and sales of all kinds are included. The adjournment of the legislature does not mean, however, that the estimated $5,000,000 a year from the sales tax is a certainty. Under the Oregon system the referendum can be invoked against any legislative act within ninety days after passage. Foreseeing the certainty of such action, the legislature provided for a special election to be held on July 21 to decide the issue. The State Grange is taking the lead in a well organized opposition to the tax.

In addition to passing the sales tax, the Oregon legislature lowered exemptions and raised rates on the personal income tax schedule, curtailed various state activities, and approved a budget for the coming biennium considerably lower than the one under which the state is now operating.

The legislature also specified that delegates to the state convention to act on the twenty-first amendment to the Federal Constitution should be voted for at the special election, and that all other measures on which a referendum is invoked shall be then voted on.

An unusual measure passed by the legislature makes the public utilities commissioner practically a dictator in his sphere. A feature of this bill was the revenue provision appropriating $150,000 for the biennium as a starter. When this fund is exhausted through investigations begun by the commissioner, he is permitted to levy a prorated tax against all utilities. If investigation further shows some particular utility to be the offender, the commission and the special board has power to levy not to exceed one-half of 1 per cent against the gross revenue of the company to

defray expenses. It is believed that the utilities will take steps to determine the validity of the act.

*

Ten-Dollar Tax Payments.—The Bureau of Municipal Research of Philadelphia suggests that any sum more than $10 should be accepted in part payment of taxes, or that payments might be made in multiples of ten. The Bureau states that the only device introduced in that city to facilitate tax paying is the authorization of payment in two equal installments; whereas New York City has recently been issuing "revenue notes" in denominations of ten dollars and upwards to taxpayers who can make payments to the city in advance of regular tax payment dates, these notes to be received at par and accrued interest in payment of taxes. In Chicago a similar scheme is being inaugurated.

*

The New York Municipal Review.—A monthly magazine containing a summary and criticism of New York City news in regard to city finances, political developments and personalities, and governmental and departmental activity, is being published at 34 Stuyvesant Street, New York City. Besides the regular departments, each issue of the *New York Municipal Review* contains special articles on the above topics. The yearly subscription rate is $1.00.

*

Detroit in Political Upheaval.— Resignation of Frank Murphy as mayor of Detroit, to become governor-general of the Philippine Islands, again throws the city and its problems into the whirlpool of political uncertainty due to frequent and rapid changes in the office of chief executive. While the mayor has full appointive powers under the charter, the two-year term has been itself abbreviated by a variety of unforeseen occurrences, such as illness and a mayoral recall, which have made it difficult to establish a fixed municipal policy over a period of time.

Frank Couzens, president of the city council, becomes acting mayor, to serve till Jan. 1, 1934. Though he has developed recognized understanding and skill in city affairs, he is only thirty years old. He has not yet decided whether to adhere to his original plan of remaining in the council of nine at least four years before becoming a candidate for mayor.

Naturally the situation, because of the appointive powers of the mayor, creates much unrest in the city government and with the public, at a time when debt refunding, budget decisions, and other questions await solution. But so long as cities allow or prefer to let uncertainties of politics be a substitute for administrative competence and continuity, of course they should expect to suffer the consequences of such procedure.

W. P. Lovett.

Detroit Citizens League

*

California Crime Survey.—The direct cost of crime to the governmental units of California was $30,224,601 in 1931. This was 6.5 per cent of the total operating costs of these governments. Police and investigation accounted for about 64 per cent of amount. Penal and corrective activities, the prosecution of crime, and court expenses were the other elements. These are some of the facts established by the survey made under the auspices of the Crime Problem Advisory Committee of California, a committee appointed by the governor, which has recently presented its report. Most of the detailed work of this Committee was carried on by the Bureau of Public Administration of the University of California, Samuel C. May, director. The above findings are from the report of the subcommittee on costs of crime. Other subcommittees reported on causes of crime, penal methods, classification of prisoners, criminal statistics, juvenile crime, and the legal aspects of crime.

*

New York City Pension Systems.—In times such as these no item in a municipal budget is exempt from scrutiny. In the past few months even fixed charges have been reëxamined and their "fixity" questioned. Dr. Paul Studenski, of New York University, who has recently completed a study of the twelve pension systems of New York for the Citizens' Budget Commission, points out that pension contributions are not as irreducible as is usually assumed. His study disclosed the fact that annual savings of approximately $5,000,000 would be possible if the contributions of employees were increased to a point where all of the systems were on an actuarial basis, if the excessively liberal provisions relating to death benefits, credit for service outside the city, etc., were modified, and if various other measures were adopted. New York's pension funds in 1932 received $52,700,000, the city contributing $29,000,000.

Published
Monthly by the
NATIONAL
MUNICIPAL
LEAGUE
Volume XXII, No. 7
TOTAL NO. 205

NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW

CONTENTS FOR JULY

League's Business 306
Editorial Comment ..... *Howard P. Jones* 307
Headlines ..... *H. P. J.* 309
Organizing to Save Our Communities ..... *Thomas H. Reed* 310
Constructive versus Destructive Economy ..... *Glenn Frank* 313
Saving Money in State Government ..... *A. N. Holcombe* 317
How Massachusetts Has Kept Her Costs Low ..... *Joseph B. Ely* 320
The Crisis in Government Economy ..... *Albert C. Ritchie* 323
Progress in International Municipal Research *G. Montagu Harris* 329
Albemarle County, Virginia, Adopts the Executive Plan ..... *George W. Spicer* 331
Sweeping Reorganization in Colorado *Allen Moore, and Lashley Grey Harvey* 334

DEPARTMENTS

I. Proportional Representation ..... *Edited by George H. Hallett, Jr.* 336
II. Recent Books Reviewed ..... *Edited by Edna Trull* 340
III. Governmental Research Association Notes ..... *Edited by Robert M. Paige* 344
IV. Notes and Events ..... *Edited by H. M. Olmsted* 349

The contents of the National Municipal Review are indexed in the *Engineering Index Service*, the *Index to Legal Periodicals*, the *International Index to Periodicals* and in *Public Affairs Information Service*.

COPYRIGHT, JULY, 1933

THE LEAGUE'S BUSINESS

New Jersey Taxpayers' Association Endorses Manager Plan.— The May issue of the New Jersey Taxpayers' Association official publication, *Taxegram,* carries a long excerpt from the pamphlet of the National Municipal League, "The Story of the City Manager Plan." "This plan," the editor comments, "may point the way out of the mire to many who are seeking a solution of their local problem of taxation."

Splendid Response to New Radio Series.— The new radio series on constructive economy in government arranged by the Committee on Citizens' Councils for Constructive Economy, of which Thomas H. Reed is chairman, was off to a splendid start on June 20 with Dr. Reed and Glenn Frank, president of the University of Wisconsin, striking the keynote of the series. Within forty-eight hours more than one hundred requests for additional information on the citizens' council program had reached the National Municipal League office. The fifteen-week series may be heard every Tuesday evening from 7:15 to 7:45 eastern daylight saving time, following Amos 'n Andy over the WJZ network of the National Broadcasting System. Tune in—here are the programs for the next six weeks:[1]

July 4—"The Crisis in Government Economy." *Albert C. Ritchie,* Governor of Maryland.

July 11—"Mr. Taxpayer versus Mr. Taxspender." *Daniel W. Hoan,* Mayor of Milwaukee; *Louis Brownlow,* Director, Public Administration Clearing House, Chicago.

July 19—"Protecting the Taxpayer's Dollar." *William A. Comstock,* Governor of Michigan; *Professor H. L. Caverly,* University of Michigan.

July 25—"Reducing the School Budget." *Professor John K. Norton,* Chairman, Joint Commission on Emergency in Education of the National Education Association; *Robert E. Simon,* Education Chairman, United Parents Association; *Professor George S. Counts,* Columbia University.

August 1—"Reducing the Library Budget." *H. L. Woolhiser,* City Manager, Winnetka, Illinois; *Ora L. Wildermuth,* Attorney, Gary, Indiana; *Carl H. Milam,* Secretary, American Library Association.

August 8—"Reducing the Welfare Budget." *Clarence Phelps Dodge,* Washington, D. C.; *Dr. Lewis Meriam,* Brookings Institution; *Frank Bane,* Director, American Public Welfare Association.

Annual Convention of the League.— The National Conference on Government, comprising the annual meeting of the National Municipal League, the Governmental Research Association, and the National Association of Civic Secretaries, will be held at the Hotel Chalfonte-Haddon Hall, Atlantic City, New Jersey, on November 9, 10, and 11, it was decided by the council at its meeting in Chicago, May 27.

Commendation from the Legislative Reference Office of Colorado.— "I am finding the NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW an increasingly valuable source of information for legislative reference work use. It is particularly gratifying that you are planning to publish the radio programs in the 'You and Your Government' series." (Signed, *Allen Moore*)

Judges for the Annual Baldwin Prize Contest.—The following have consented to serve as judges of the annual Baldwin prize essay contest: Robert M. Goodrich, Providence Governmental Research Bureau; Professor W. E. Mosher, Syracuse University; and Dr. William B. Munro, Pasadena, California. Seventeen essays have been received in competition, and the announcement of the award will be made on this page in a later issue.

HOWARD P. JONES, *Secretary*

[1]A folder containing the programs for the entire series may be had by writing this office.